

The Questions of Jesus in John

Biblical Interpretation Series

Editors in Chief

Paul Anderson
Yvonne Sherwood

Editorial Board

Akma Adam – Roland Boer – Musa Dube
Jennifer L. Koosed – Vernon Robbins
Annette Schellenberg – Carolyn J. Sharp
Johanna Stiebert – Duane Watson
Ruben Zimmermann

VOLUME 115

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bins

The Questions of Jesus in John

Logic, Rhetoric and Persuasive Discourse

By

Douglas Estes



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Estes, Douglas.

The questions of Jesus in John : logic, rhetoric and persuasive discourse / by Douglas Estes.

p. cm. — (Biblical interpretation series, 0928-0731 ; v. 115)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-20510-9 (alk. paper)—ISBN 978-90-04-24029-2 (e-book)

1. Bible. N.T. John—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Jesus Christ. 3. Question (Logic) I. Title.

BS2615.52.E88 2013

226.5'066—dc23

2012031732

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731

ISBN 978-90-04-20510-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-24029-2 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

for Bridget

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	xi
List of Abbreviations	xiii
 1. Why Questions?	 1
The Propositional Problem	2
Lost in Declaration	6
<i>Quor Quaestiones?</i>	9
Johannine Questions	12
 2. Perspectives on Questions	 14
Asking Questions	14
Ancient Questions	15
Questions in Hebraic Context	16
Questions in Greco-Roman Context	20
Modern Questions	27
Questions and Answers	28
Questions and Truth	30
Questions and Speech	31
 3. How Questions Work	 33
Questions vs. Questions	34
Questioning Questions	37
Defining Questions	39
Question Elements	42
The Syntax of Questions	43
The Semantics of Questions	45
The Pragmatics of Questions	47
The Traditional Approach to Questions	49
Informational Qualities of Questions	52
Rhetorical Qualities of Questions	54
 4. John's Use of Questions	 57
Why John Uses Questions	58
Questions Inform Dialogue	59
Questions Persuade Readers	61

Obstacles to John's Questions	64
Question Types & Case Studies	68
5. Open Questions	69
Variable Questions	71
Case Study: John 7:19c	73
Set Questions	76
Case Study: John 8:46a	77
6. Reflective Questions	81
Indexical Questions	83
Case Study: John 11:26b	85
Test Questions	87
Case Study: John 18:4b,7a	89
Conditional Questions	91
Case Study: John 3:12	94
Speculative Questions	97
Case Study: John 6:62	99
Sequence Questions	103
Case Study: John 1:38a	105
Expository Questions	107
Case Study: John 8:43	109
7. Decisive Questions	111
Polar Questions	113
Case Study: John 5:6	116
Alternative Questions	118
Case Study: John 18:34	120
Deliberative Questions	123
Case Study: John 18:11b	125
8. Responsive Questions	128
Opposing-Turn Questions	131
Case Study: John 3:10	133
Echo Questions	136
Case Study: John 13:38	138
Retort Questions	140
Case Study: John 11:9a	142

9. Coercive Questions	145
Loaded Questions	147
Case Study: John 9:35	149
Negative Polar Questions	152
Case Study: John 11:40	155
Biased Questions	157
Case Study: John 8:10b	160
10. Answers and Questions	163
John, a Dialectical Gospel	166
John, a Rhetorical Gospel	168
Future Questions	171
Bibliography	173
Index of Modern Authors	199
Index of Subjects	205
Index of Ancient Sources	210
Index of Greek Terms	215

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Every man is a piece of the continent. For the completion of this work, I owe many debts of gratitude to those who formed a part of the writing process and a part of my life.

I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to my 'family' at Berryessa Valley Church, in San Jose, California. Greatest thanks goes to Chuck and Marivic Mora, great friends and workers in the field. May God richly bless your lives. I especially want to thank Rex Shipman, Addie Edward, and David Knoblich for their faithfulness. While there are so many BVCers who were instrumental in so many ways, I want to acknowledge Eva Boulware, Lolita (Mang) Estrada, CJ Young, Seth Foreman, Jyothsna Chiluka, Rachel and Brian Keish, Kristine Richardson, Gary and Mary Appel, Widodo Krisman and Hanny Bongso, all the Gajardos, Ray Knoblich, Gail Shelley, and Richard and Annie Machado.

A great appreciation to those who invested time in this particular book: Thanks to the wonderful staff at Brill, especially Liesbeth Hugenholtz; to the Biblical Interpretation editorial board, especially Paul Anderson and R. Alan Culpepper; to Ed Gerber, Yongbom Lee, Noël Estes, and Brian LePort, for their suggestions and encouragement; and to David Frees, for a pinch of inspiration. Plus special thanks to Tom Brodie and the Dominican Biblical Institute for their grace in allowing me to finish this book up while trying to start my postdoc.

Thanks also to Gary Tuck, Richard Bell, and David Beck, for their mentorship over the years.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude that can never be repaid to my mom, Nadine Estes, for her unwavering support long after I have left the nest and flown the coop. As always, she made it possible.

There are so many others I'd love to thank, including, Eric Estes, Jason, Su-Anne and Hudson Estes, Lillie Boothe, Fred and Nita Boothe, Mary Ann and Ron Poythress, Terrell and Linda Boothe, Jason and Gretchen Woods, Ken and Emily Mears, Matt and Jaime Reed, Douglas R. Estes, Jr. and Ruth Cantrell, plus the rest of my extended family, and so many more than space will allow.

Above all, my greatest love and appreciation goes to my family: my courageous warrior, Wyatt; my 'busy' princess, Bridget; my sweet baby Violet—and my amazing, incomparable wife, Noël. Nawapenda na barikiwa.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAJP</i>	<i>Australasian Journal of Philosophy</i>
ABC	Anchor Bible Commentary
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACNT	Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AJS</i>	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
AL	Argumentation Library
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANCTP	Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Philosophy
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
<i>APQ</i>	<i>American Philosophical Quarterly</i>
ASCP	Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World
BCP	Blackwell Companions to Philosophy
BDAG	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHL	Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTL	Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CamSL	Cambridge Studies in Linguistics
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBSC	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CILT	Current Issues in Linguistic Theory
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRiS/PI	Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface
CSAP	Continuum Studies in Ancient Philosophy
CSDP	Cambridge Studies in the Dialogues of Plato

CSL	Current Studies in Linguistics
CTL	Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics
CW	<i>Classical World</i>
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
ESN	<i>European Scientific Notes</i>
FC	Fathers of the Church
GPS	Grazer Philosophische Studien
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HaNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HoNTC	Holman New Testament Commentary
HPQ	<i>History of Philosophy Quarterly</i>
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HTS	<i>Hervormde Theologiese Studies</i>
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ISIS	<i>Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure</i>
JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JAP	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBQ	<i>Jewish Bible Quarterly</i>
JCR	<i>Journal of Communication and Religion</i>
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies Series
JEP	<i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>
JEP: LMC	<i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JHI	<i>Journal of the History of Ideas</i>
JLS	<i>Journal of the Learning Sciences</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of the Philosophy of History</i>
JPhil	<i>Journal of Philosophy</i>
JPL	<i>Journal of Philosophical Logic</i>
JPrag	<i>Journal of Pragmatics</i>
JPSP	<i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series

<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JTSA</i>	<i>Journal of Theology for Southern Africa</i>
<i>JVLVB</i>	<i>Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LTPM	Louvain Theological & Pastoral Monographs
<i>LP</i>	<i>Linguistics and Philosophy</i>
<i>MLJ</i>	<i>Modern Language Journal</i>
MNS	Mnemosyne Supplements
NAC	New American Commentary
<i>NAJP</i>	<i>North American Journal of Psychology</i>
NCB	New Century Bible
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NLH</i>	<i>New Literary History</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTR	New Testament Readings
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
ODL	Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics
OSCS	Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax
OSTL	Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics
ÖTKNT	Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament
OWC	Oxford World's Classics
P&BNS	Pragmatics and Beyond New Series
<i>PAS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society</i>
<i>PPR</i>	<i>Philosophy and Phenomenological Research</i>
<i>PQ</i>	<i>Philosophical Quarterly</i>
<i>PRev</i>	<i>Philosophical Review</i>
<i>QJS</i>	<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>
<i>RAEI</i>	<i>Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses</i>
<i>RelS</i>	<i>Religious Studies</i>
<i>RSQ</i>	<i>Rhetoric Society Quarterly</i>
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SBLECL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Christianity and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SDG	Studies in Discourse and Grammar
SIS	Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics
SLL	Synthese Language Library
SNTI	Studies in New Testament Interpretation
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPQ	<i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>
SSCFL	Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TBzL	Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TLSM	Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs
TPAPA	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
TSP	Toronto Studies in Philosophy
VKNAW	Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

CHAPTER ONE

WHY QUESTIONS?

Before I refuse to take your questions, I have an opening statement.
—Ronald Reagan

According to John, Jesus asked questions.

Why did Jesus ask questions—instead of just giving answers?

Why did John bother to include Jesus' questions—instead of just his statements?

What do questions *do* in John—and do they make a difference to the readers of John's Gospel?

Do the questions of Jesus in John matter—or are they merely window-dressing?

At first these questions may elicit simple responses:

Jesus asked questions because questions are a typical part of narrative and dialogue.

John included those questions as part of the narrative and dialogue.

The questions of Jesus are questions typical for this kind of literature, and they make a difference in that they carry the story along.

The questions of Jesus in John do matter; but only as a narrative device, not substantively. They matter less than the statements—the theology—put forth in the gospel. The questions are there to spice up the narrative so readers can stay awake long enough to dig out the nuggets of theological truth.

How important are the questions of Jesus in John? This depends on who you ask. Is it merely an interesting coincidence that the very first words of Jesus in John are a question ("What do you seek?") *and* the very last words of Jesus in John are a question ("What is it to you?")?¹

¹ The first words spoken by a narrative's protagonist carry extra degrees of significance; see for example, Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic, 1981), 74; Ben Witherington, III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 69; John Painter, "Inclined to God: The Quest for Eternal Life—Bultmannian Hermeneutics and the Theology of the Fourth Gospel," in *Exploring*

Or that the first words of Jesus after his resurrection also take the form of a question (“Woman, why are you weeping?”)? Or that questions usually serve as openings or climaxes for Jesus’ discourse?² Or that the most common narrative device in John’s Gospel is the question?³ Or one of the most significant?⁴ Scholars have written book after book after book on the statements of Jesus in John, with little or no attention paid to the questions.

I believe the questions of Jesus in John—by which I mean, the questions Jesus *asks*—are far more significant than past treatments have afforded. They deserve a second look as to their meaning, usage and purpose in the Fourth Gospel. With very few exceptions, readers of the gospel have overlooked their worth throughout the years; they have bypassed the questions to get to the *real* meaning and substance, the statements. I will argue in this book that a deeper investigation of the questions of Jesus is long overdue.⁵ I will also argue that these questions are more meaningful than Western readers realize, in part due to foundational presuppositions received from the Western tradition.⁶

The Propositional Problem

Most readers of the gospels read them to see what Jesus will *say*, not to see what Jesus will *ask*. More problematically, many modern readers of the gospels read the texts to pick out the most important statements of Jesus, divorced of their context, and segregated from the original questions

the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 354; and Robert H. Smith, “‘Seeking Jesus’ in the Gospel of John,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 15:1 (1988): 51.

² For example, openings such as John 1:38 (first disciples), 2:4 (mother), 5:6 (disabled man), 6:5 (Philip), 8:10 (alleged adulterer), 9:35 (blind man), 18:34 (Pilate), 20:15 (Mary Magdalene), and 21:5 (last disciples); and climaxes such as 3:10 (Jesus’ wake-up call to Nicodemus), 7:19 (Jesus’ challenge of the crowd’s intent), 11:26 (Jesus’ call for decision from Martha), 18:11 (Jesus’ arrest), and 21:17 (Jesus’ call for decision from Peter).

³ Jo-Ann A. Brant, *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 194.

⁴ Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11*, NAC 25A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 177.

⁵ In writing this book, I intentionally chose to limit my study to the questions Jesus asked, omitting other questions in the Fourth Gospel (such as those asked of Jesus by other characters). This is no reflection on the value of those questions, which I do believe would be fruitful for further study. For a preliminary take on those, see Henry J. Cadbury, *Jesus: What Manner of Man* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2008).

⁶ I will not argue questions are superior to statements, or that they are somehow the key to “unlocking” the gospel. I will not argue they are a theme, or motif, or a paradigm.

that spawned those statements. In fact, of all the canonical gospels, John is most known for its powerful statements by Jesus. Thousands of books have been written on the statements of Jesus in John, but none on the questions of Jesus in John. The reason is not simply that we prefer statements, or that statements are inherently superior; there is much more to it than that. The reason extends all the way back to the beginning of the Western tradition.

Western readers are *biased* against questions.⁷ This may seem harsh but it is true. Whether we realize it or not, Western readers are biased toward statements. The pedagogical course we endure from children through adolescence to adulthood is based on making statements and defining propositions and not at all on asking questions, even though the ability to ask questions appropriately is the basis for human learning and understanding.⁸ The result of this bias is that questions have historically been overlooked or ignored in the modern study of philosophy, history, narrative and theology. The problem of bias is acute, going back more than two millennia. However, this was not always the case. Many thinkers of the ancient world valued questions in a way we moderns cannot appreciate today. As an example, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c. 280–207 BC) believed questions were so important that he wrote fourteen books on questions and questioning.⁹ Thus, the disconnect between the view of questions in the ancient world to the modern world is severe. From a modern perspective, questions are not a well-studied phenomenon, though interest in them has started to grow in the last century.¹⁰

⁷ Throughout this work I will use the word “question” in a broad, non-technical way to mean any speech or utterance with an interrogative form or nature. We will develop a more exact meaning in Chapter 2. Likewise I will use the words “proposition,” “assertion,” and “declaration” in mostly synonymous ways while recognizing they each possess different nuances that if discussed would be beyond the scope of this work. Modern logic defines “proposition” slightly differently than I do within this book; Robin Smith, “Ancient Greek Philosophical Logic,” in *A Companion to Philosophical Logic*, ed. Dale Jacquette, BCP (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 14.

⁸ Pieter A. M. Seuren, *The Logic of Language*, vol. 2 of *Language from Within* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 386; and Ashwin Ram, “A Theory of Questions and Question Asking,” *JLS* 1: 3/4 (1991): 273, 289. To add to this irony, what little use of questions in learning environments there is come from the teacher, often with an institutional/interrogation approach that may curb learning by students; see J. T. Dillon, “Questioning the Use of Questions,” *JEP* 83:1 (1991): 163–164.

⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.191.

¹⁰ Thomas Reid, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1843), 567; Christopher Hookway, “Questions of Context: The Presidential Address,” *PAS* 96 (1996): 8; Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., “Declaratives Are Not Enough,” *Philosophical Studies* 59:1 (1990): 1; James Somerville, *The Epistemological Significance of the Interrogative*, ANCTP (Aldershot:

Aristotle (384–322 BC) bears some of the blame for this disconnect. Prior to Aristotle, the thinking-about-questioning (*erotesis*; ἐρώτησις) was probably rooted in the desire (*Eros*; ἔρως) for truth, knowledge and beauty, or at least in the practice of rhetoric.¹¹ The early Sophist Protagoras (c. 490–420 BC) spoke of a logic of sentences for rhetoric of which questions were one among many; he also included wishes (εὐχολή), commands (ἐντολή), and answers (ἀπόκρισις).¹² Socrates (469–399 BC) and Plato (c. 427–347 BC) are well-known for their logical development of the question, so much so that Socrates even has a method of using questions named for his oratory. Plato was the first known philosopher to consider the implications of semantics and syntax in his philosophy. Aristotle carried over much of his predecessors' interest in questions in his works such as *Metaphysics* and *Rhetoric*, but something apparently changed in Aristotle by the time he wrote the fourth chapter of *Interpretation*. Aristotle wrote:

A sentence (λόγος) is significant speech, of which this or that part may have meaning—as something, that is, that is uttered but not as expressing a judgment of a positive or negative character. . . . But while every sentence has meaning, though not as an instrument of nature but, as we observed, by convention, not all can be called propositions. We call propositions (ἀπόφανσις) those only that have truth or falsity in them. A prayer is, for instance, a sentence but neither has truth nor has falsity. Let us pass over all such, as their study more properly belongs to the province of rhetoric or poetry. (Aristotle, *Int.* 17a1–8, Cook)¹³

Ashgate, 2002), 6; and Jeroen Groenendijk and Martin Stokhof, “Questions,” in *Handbook of Logic and Language*, ed. Johan van Benthem and Alice ter Meulen (Cambridge: MIT, 1997), 1058–59.

¹¹ C. E. M. Struyker Boudier, “Toward a History of the Question,” in *Questions and Questioning*, edited by Michel Meyer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 14; Marina McCoy, *Plato on the Rhetoric of Philosophers and Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 83, 145; and Ronna Burger, *Plato's Phaedrus: A Defense of a Philosophic Art of Writing* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1980), 135.

¹² David H. Kelly, “Case: Grammar and Terminology,” *CW* 87:1 (1993): 37; cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.4.10.

¹³ J. L. Ackrill translates this as: “A sentence is a significant spoken sound some part of which is significant in separation—as an expression, not as an affirmation. . . . Every sentence is significant (not as a tool but, as we said, by convention), but not every sentence is a statement-making sentence, but only those in which there is truth or falsity. There is not truth or falsity in all sentences: a prayer is a sentence but is neither true nor false. The present investigation deals with the statement-making sentence; the others we can dismiss, since consideration of them belongs rather to the study of rhetoric or poetry”; see Aristotle, *Int.* 17a1–8, Ackrill. Note the difference in the translation of technical words such as ἀπόφανσις.

As a result of Aristotle's argument, propositions—statements that *say* things—took center stage in academic study.¹⁴ Questions, as well as other non-propositional statements, quickly became second class citizens within the kingdoms of language, philosophy, and science.¹⁵

To study questions today presents a much larger challenge to the researcher than would first appear. The reason is because our modern, Western thought process—the way we search for information, explain points and construct arguments—is thoroughly *propositional*.¹⁶ It is based on propositions, statements that can be made or true and false claims (as per Aristotle), and not on questions we may have or beliefs we may hold.¹⁷ In many ways modernity's deification of rational and scientific thought is a direct by-product of the Aristotelian crowning of propositional reasoning. The problem with this viewpoint is that it is not completely true; or rather, it is more complicated than the simple line echoed in Boethius (c. 480–c. 525), Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) and many other modern philosophers that 'only propositions have truth value.'¹⁸ This has led to a certain degree of propositional tyranny, wherein modern logicians and philosophers can either dismiss questions as not really real or downplay questions as simply a subset of propositions or quirks of grammar.¹⁹

This severely misses the point. Propositions are not the only way in which we may discover knowledge, define truth or describe the world. In fact, there can actually be no meaningful proposition *unless* there is first a question that provides meaning to the proposition. To put it in the most basic perspective, the naked proposition "the sky is blue" is without

¹⁴ Richard Gaskin, *The Unity of the Proposition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 6; and Hans Robert Jauss, *Question and Answer: Forms of Dialogic Understanding*, ed. and trans. by Michael Hays, *Theory and History of Literature* 68 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 68. Nuancing this, Michel Meyer argues this turn started with Plato; see Michel Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning: Socrates and Plato," *APQ* 17:4 (1980): 285.

¹⁵ There are a few exceptions to this, such as in rabbinic writings, Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* and Augustine's *Confessions*.

¹⁶ Belnap, "Declaratives," 5.

¹⁷ Throughout this work I will use the word "proposition" in a broad, non-technical way to mean any speech or utterance with an assertive or declarative form or nature; a statement.

¹⁸ Boethius's *De Topicis Differentiis*, trans. Eleonore Stump (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 30; *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. William Molesworth (London: John Bohn, 1840), 4:24; and Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, trans. J. N. Findlay, *International Library of Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2001), 2:325.

¹⁹ Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1057–59.

meaning unless we first know what question was asked (explicit or not) to elicit this statement.²⁰ If the question was, “What color is the sky?” the meaning is different than if the question was “How do we differentiate the sky from the grass?” Because Western tradition is so propositionally conditioned, this example may appear more of a language game than a serious question of logic. It is not. Suppose someone approached you as you were walking to the store and said, “The sky is blue”—your immediate response would be to ask a question in return (“Why are you telling me this?” or “What do you mean?”). This is because everyday language betrays the cracks in the logic of the propositional monolith. In a sense, questions are of a more embryonic order than propositions.²¹ To get at the questions of Jesus in John, and to understand them as deeper than merely part of a language game meant to support propositions, we will have to begin to think differently about questions.

Lost in Declaration

Ludwig Wittgenstein contended the primary mistake philosophers make is a “one-sided diet.”²² There can be no doubt that, as a whole, the study of the Fourth Gospel and other biblical texts are comprised of one-sided diets, malnourished by critics who unwittingly privilege propositions over other language forms such as questions, exclamations, commands, wishes, hopes and beliefs. It is not that propositions are not significant—I do not wish to ever disparage propositions or their importance for reading the gospel. It is simply that these other forms of language are significant as well. They make for a more well-rounded and healthy reading diet. At a minimum, our study of questions will shed more light on the propositions in the gospel. And at most, our study of questions will open the door to

²⁰ R. G. Collingwood, *An Essay on Metaphysics*, rev. ed., ed. Rex Martin (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 23; Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London: Continuum, 2004), 363; Jean-François Lyotard, *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*, trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 139; Nick Turnbull, “Rhetorical Agency as a Property of Questioning,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 37:3 (2004): 213; Noël Carroll, “Narrative Closure,” *Philosophical Studies* 135:1 (2007): 8; Hookway, “Questions of Context,” 8–10; Roberta Kevelson, “How’s of Why’s and Why’s of How’s: Relation of Method and Cause in Inquiry,” *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 94; and cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.3.

²¹ Belnap, “Declaratives,” 17.

²² Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, rev. 4th ed., trans. G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 85.

considering the gospel in a whole new light. The reason is that propositions are not enough to convey the full meaning of the Fourth Gospel. To paraphrase Nuel Belnap, “Propositions ain’t enough.”²³

Let’s do a thought experiment to consider how deep the bias against questions runs. As we read the Gospel of John, we are trained to think about the statements that Jesus says. Some of the most remarked upon declarations in John are any one of the ‘I am’ statements. For example, in John 10:11a, Jesus says, “I am the good shepherd.” Propositions such as this one are often considered the ‘peak’ of the gospel text, and are frequently taken from context and used as a naked proposition as in our example, “the sky is blue.” This ‘I am’ statement is a proposition of propositions, as it is substantially more studied and discussed by scholars and readers than, for example, the preceding proposition, “The thief comes only to steal and to kill and to destroy.” John 10:11a occurs in P45, an early manuscript datable to the early third century. It reads *εγω ειμι ο καλος ποιμην*]. Now for the experiment: *How do we really know that this is a statement rather than a question?* At first blush this question seems ridiculous. Surely we *know* it is a statement. But how do we know it is a statement? Is it not possible to translate *εγω ειμι ο καλος ποιμην* as “Am I the good shepherd?” It is. The same is true of John 10:11b.

If we word John 10:11 as a question instead of a proposition, the impact of the passage changes in a startling way:

So again Jesus said to them, “Very truly, I tell you, I am the gate for the sheep. All who came before me are thieves and bandits; but the sheep did not listen to them. I am the gate. Whoever enters by me will be saved, and will come in and go out and find pasture. The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.

Am I the good shepherd? The good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep? The hired hand, who is not the shepherd and does not own the sheep, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and runs away—and the wolf snatches them and scatters them. The hired hand runs away because a hired hand does not care for the sheep. *I am the good shepherd!* I know my own and my own know me, just as the Father knows me and I know the Father. And I lay down my life for the sheep. (John 10:7–15, NRSV, punctuation and emphasis mine)

²³ Belnap, “Declaratives.”

Substituting a question emphasis instead of an assertive emphasis brings out new shades of contrast between the good shepherd and the hired hand. The dramatic quality and persuasive feel of the passage increase substantially. Other overtones begin to emerge. End of thought experiment.

I am not arguing that John 10:11 was or is intended as a question. I believe it is a proposition.²⁴ To be fair, we may never know for certain for several reasons, including the fact that John 10:11 is incomplete and that it is missing punctuation marks in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$.²⁵ Without punctuation marks there is no clear way to determine in a written text such as the New Testament whether a sentence is a question, a declaration, an exclamation or any other possibility.²⁶ However, the problem runs deeper as punctuation marks are not the silver bullet to sentence identification we moderns assume them to be. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the earliest New Testament manuscripts *do* have some punctuation marks, but their usage is non-standardized at best.²⁷ They did not have formal question marks (ἑρωτηματικόν) as these were a later addition appearing around the ninth century.²⁸ However, this line of thinking is a red herring—even in modern

²⁴ In contrast, compare the proposition of John 10:11a with the question of John 3:10: “ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις,” there is little grammatical or syntactical difference between the two. The scribal punctuation is evidential but we are not bound to elevating it to the deciding factor; see Bruce Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*, cor. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 32; and James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, with W. F. Howard (London: T&T Clark, 1963), 2:48.

²⁵ While not applicable in this example, one of the best clues is the use of interrogative pronouns in direct questions. We will cover this more in Chapter 3.

²⁶ H. P. V. Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek*, 5th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 127; Kenneth L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*, SBG 5 (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 89; Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th rev. ed.)*, 2nd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1994), 191; Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John* (London: United Bible Societies, 1980), 273; and cf. Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 9.32.

²⁷ Metzger, *Manuscripts*, 31; Moulton, *Grammar*, 2:45; and Charles Brewster Randolph, “The Sign of Interrogation in Greek Minuscule Manuscripts,” *CP* 5:3 (1910): 309. To date, the earliest punctuation marks in a Greek text seem to be those in the Derveni Papyrus, datable to the 4th century BC.

²⁸ A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914), 242; Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Palaeography and Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), 389; and Randolph, “Sign of Interrogation,” 309. From the previous example, Codex Sinaiticus (4th century) shows what was probably considered a midstop at that time (high period; στιγμή τελεία) after both Ἰσραὴλ and γινώσκεις.

texts with precise punctuation, it is impossible to truly distinguish a proposition from a question this way.²⁹ If in a simple story we read:

Wyatt looked at Bridget and said, "Can you feed the cat."
 "You tell me," she huffed.

It is impossible to know for certain whether Wyatt's speech is more a command or a question (even with the punctuation), or a half-hearted suggestion.³⁰ As far as Bridget's response reveals, Wyatt's speech is probably some type of question, but it is punctuated (accurately) as a propositional statement. This is just a simple example to demonstrate that punctuation does not really control sentential functions.³¹ Punctuation is a clue, a signal, and in some cases, not a very good one. Whenever we read a text, there is always a degree of ambiguity present that is not present in the same way as if we were to hear the same sentence spoken. If we heard this sentence spoken, we would receive additional prosodic and rhetorical clues from our eyes and ears that would help clarify the meaning of Wyatt's speech.³² And in this way we leave Aristotle and his legacy and return to Protagoras and Socrates. They understood what is often lost in a punctuation-proposition culture: The logic and rhetoric of questions (and other non-propositional sentence and clause types) can often convey more truth and meaning than naked propositions.³³

Quor Quaestiones?

In this book I will show the value of questions, without making questions a curious sideshow at the circus of propositions in the words of Jesus in

²⁹ Chung-hye Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions," *Lingua* 112 (2002): 216.

³⁰ Cf. John Lyons, *Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 2:754.

³¹ The primary purpose of punctuation is "to separate units of grammar and discourse (paragraphs, sentences, clauses, phrases, and words) from each other," and only secondarily to express meaning; see David Crystal, *How Language Works: How Babies Babble, Words Change Meaning, and Languages Live or Die* (New York: Avery, 2007), 118–20.

³² This is most clearly seen in the use of sign language, where non-verbal clues are sufficient to distinguish between a wide array of speech forms; see Margalit Fox, *Talking Hands: What Sign Language Reveals about the Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007), 173.

³³ Throughout this book, I will frequently use the terms 'logic' and 'rhetoric' in a broad, general sense, not necessarily connected to any one particular system from either the ancient or modern world. When I am referring to a particular logic or rhetoric, it will be spelled out in the text.

John. To put it another way, I hope to dig deep enough to begin to see what the questions of Jesus in John are *asking* and not so much what they are *saying*. Questions, when treated as such, are very different animals than statements; their nature and content are ontologically distinct from propositions.³⁴ At the same time questions—in their own right—are a very important part of the complete λόγος of Jesus in John. Therefore I will try not to overly isolate the questions we will consider, though some artificial isolation will occur. If handled properly, the logic and rhetoric of questions in John will give greater insight into the meaning of the gospel.

Questions have many values and uses, but I want to highlight three values here that are critical for our investigation. The first relates to *narrative*. A narrative is similar to a “story,” though in a more precise definition, a narrative chronicles a series of events or actions. Narratives are situations that occur in time.³⁵ The Fourth Gospel is narrative, whereas other texts containing questions may not be narratives: They could be lists of data, arguments, legal briefs, scientific reports, manuals, song sheets or any other non-narrative text form. While questions are not unique to narrative, questions do have value in that they possess unique narrative functions. The most prominent is the ability of questions to structure narrative.³⁶ Consider a story that is a sequence of events listed one right after another. A story structured in this way would be rather boring. In contrast when one reads a narrative and comes across a question—even if the question is not put to the reader but a character in the story—it elicits a pause and a momentary shift in thinking in the reader (John 9:35). Questions are very good tools for establishing boundaries or opening new avenues for pursuit in the reading process (John 11:9a).³⁷

³⁴ Belnap, “Declaratives,” 4–5; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 34; Didier Coste, *Narrative as Communication* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 226; Jonathan Ginzburg, “Interrogatives: Questions, Facts and Dialogue,” in *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, edited by Shalom Lappin (London: Blackwell, 1997), 399; and C. L. Hamblin, “Questions Aren’t Statements,” *Philosophy of Science* 30:1 (1963): 62.

³⁵ Gerald Prince, “Narrative Analysis and Narratology,” *NLH* 13:2 (1982): 179; Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge, 1994), 2; Carlota S. Smith, “The Domain of Tense,” in *The Syntax of Time*, CSL 37, ed. Jacqueline Guéron and Jacqueline Lecarme (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004), 604; and Douglas Estes, *The Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel: A Theory of Hermeneutical Relativity in the Gospel of John*, BIS 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 6–10.

³⁶ Jeanne Fahnestock and Marie Secor, *A Rhetoric of Argument*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), 343; Elizabeth Minchin, “Rhythm and Regularity in Homeric Composition: Questions in the *Odyssey*,” in *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. C. J. Mackie, MNS 248 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 34; and Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 71.

³⁷ Coste, *Narrative*, 226.

The second value of questions in narrative relates to their *logic*.³⁸ Propositions, especially naked propositions, have the ability to say things (to impart meaning) but they are essentially monological. In contrast, questions are essentially dialogical; questions are ‘raised’ within the text as well as between the author or narrator and the reader. The English colloquialism ‘raised’ here does a good job of pictorializing the new second dimension opened by questions in contrast to one-dimensional propositions. Another way of saying this is that while propositions are focused on information content (data), questions are focused on information exchange (development).³⁹ While a reader can learn from straight propositional content, questions buttress and reinforce learning by adding nuance and conditioning to the reading and learning process.⁴⁰ Propositional-only discourse would not only be boring; it would be an impoverished learning strategy. Even if we accept for a moment that only propositions have truth content, questions still have the ability to define and qualify truth (John 10:34).⁴¹ Therefore the questions of Jesus in John are an important but overlooked part of understanding the content of Jesus’ message.

The third value of questions and their logic in narrative relates to their *rhetoric*. The word rhetoric in typical English parlance today is often likened to empty or pretentious speech, or political discourse, but we will use the word rhetoric in its classical sense of powerful, persuasive speech.⁴² Within the narrative of the Fourth Gospel, rhetoric is at work—perhaps not formal rhetoric as taught in the Greek *progymnasmata*—but the desire of the evangelist to convince whoever reads the Gospel that

³⁸ Western logic is based on propositional (*alethic*) logic, but the logic of questions (*erotetic logic*) works in a different manner. Very simply put, alethic logic is founded on whether a proposition is true or false (excluding modalities). Erotetic logic is generally treated as a footnote of alethic logic or ignored altogether.

³⁹ Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1122.

⁴⁰ Martin Bell, “Questioning,” *PQ* 25:100 (1975): 193; Arthur C. Graesser, Kathy L. Lang, and Richard M. Roberts, “Question Answering in the Context of Stories,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 120:3 (1991): 254; and Aimee A. Callender and Mark A. McDaniel, “The Benefits of Embedded Question Adjuncts for Low and High Structure Builders,” *JEP* 99:2 (2007): 339.

⁴¹ By and large modern, Western logicians follow the Aristotelian paradigm that only propositions contain truth (hence the use of *alethic* to describe the logic of propositions); however, erotetic studies in the last century have slowly chipped away at this. For example, in a legal context, a prosecutor can ask a “false” question with the intent of tricking a defendant into giving a “true” answer. While the question out of context may not have a truth value, in context it does, and functions as a powerful qualifier of truth conditions in that dialogue situation. We’ll consider this more in Chapter 2.

⁴² Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.15.34–36. On rhetoric as not limited to the legal/political realms, Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.21.1–13.

they “may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in His name.” (John 20:31, NASB).⁴³ Rhetoric is an area where questions really shine. Speakers and writers frequently use questions as strategic rhetorical devices.⁴⁴ Well-applied questions have tremendous persuasive power in that their dialogical nature causes the hearer or reader to refocus around the speaker’s argument (John 1:38a).⁴⁵ Questions also have the ability to control a conversation or a text, changing the subject or deciding whose turn it is to speak (John 6:61–62).⁴⁶ The Johannine Jesus does not ask questions out of ignorance but out of intent—asking the reader, “Do you now believe?” (John 16:31).

Johannine Questions

While the primary purpose of this study is to better understand the questions of Jesus in John, this question—as is often the case—raises other questions. In what way do the questions of Jesus in John structure the narrative? Are they a significant device or a minor feature? How does the logic of the questions of Jesus affect the reader? Are the questions of Jesus asked to raise individual questions or do they work together to encourage the reader to consider one big issue? And, perhaps most significantly, what effect do the questions of Jesus have on the reader? Do they challenge the readers of the Gospel? If the Fourth Evangelist intended the questions to be persuasive, in what way is that the case? Does it work? These are just a few of the questions we need to ask as we approach the questions of Jesus in John.

There will be some perils along the way. Because we live in a propositional world, we don’t spend time thinking about asking, we spend all of our time thinking about saying. We want to know what a person said, not what a person asked. The result of this is that we have a poorly developed

⁴³ Cf. C. Clifton Black, “‘The Words That You Gave to Me I Have Given to Them’: The Grandeur of Johannine Rhetoric,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 221.

⁴⁴ Helmut Gruber, “Questions and Strategic Orientation in Verbal Conflict Sequences,” *JPrag* 33:12 (2001): 1820.

⁴⁵ Jinjun Wang, “Questions and the Exercise of Power,” *Discourse & Society* 17:4 (2006): 534; and Douglas Walton, *Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 85.

⁴⁶ Anthony J. Liddicoat, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis* (New York: Continuum, 2007), 74; and Wang, “Questions,” 532.

language of questions. Even in scholarly circles, questions—when they are described at all—are lumped into two fuzzy categories, “normal” and “rhetorical.” Neither of these two terms have much value for getting at the heart of asking a question, and persuading an audience through questions. So we will need to develop an understanding of the way questions work first. We’ll need to ask what it means to ask in order to answer these questions and more about the questions of Jesus in John.

To this end, the goal of this book is to examine the questions of Jesus in John in light of their logical, rhetorical and linguistic virtues. This first chapter serves to introduce the reader to the very real problem that exists in handling questions in biblical interpretation. In Chapter 2, I will provide a brief overview of the different ways ancient and modern thinkers thought about questions, and in Chapter 3, I give a brief overview of the logic of questions. Chapter 4 introduces the reader to the biggest issues faced in a more accurate interpretation of questions, and acts as a segue to the later chapters. In Chapters 5 through 9, we will examine a number of question types that exist in the Fourth Gospel, with case studies in each situation to show how we can more accurately understand questions once we understand the erotetic (question-asking) logic behind them. Chapter 10 serves as the conclusion, with a summary of what we have learned and ideas for further improvement and development. Because the study of questions is, in general, so impoverished in comparison to other speech-acts, we won’t answer every question we raise. At best, *The Questions of Jesus in John* will serve as a point of departure for further discussions of the use of questions in biblical texts.

CHAPTER TWO

PERSPECTIVES ON QUESTIONS

No one asks questions in Hell.
—Sirach 41:4

Questions are so foundational to life, language and being that, ironically, we cannot easily define them. We learn to use questions at the earliest stage of language development—the ability to ask and question is a part of what makes us undeniably human.¹ The ability to use questions strikes at the core of our nature. In this way questions are little different from other primeval ideas such as hope, beauty or time—ideas we fathom more *a priori* than through any analytical method. To paraphrase the linguistics philosopher Sylvain Bromberger, “Any ignoramus can *ask* a question even when the smartest scholar cannot *say* what a question is.”² While we may not be able to define what a question is with the precision we would prefer, we can ask: How do questions work? Or, in our particular situation: How do questions work in a narrative such as the Fourth Gospel? How can a writer like John use questions, with their many functions, to reach his narrative objectives? For the rest of this book, we will consider questions along these lines; we will consider them primarily through a functional, not ontological, lens. We will need to come to terms with several basic functions of questions so that we can see how the Johannine Jesus employs questions with rhetoric and logic in an attempt to persuade readers of the Fourth Gospel.

Asking Questions

As we begin to gain insight into what questions are and how they work, we need to explore how questions function in ancient and modern contexts. Or more specifically, how people understand and use questions in both ancient and modern contexts. In the ancient world, theories of

¹ Harvey B. Sarles, *Language and Human Nature: Toward a Grammar of Interaction and Discourse*, Studies in Semiotics 13 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), 35, 175.

² Sylvain Bromberger, “Rational Ignorance,” *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 48.

interrogative use did not exist in the same way as they do in the modern world. Ancient philosophers discussed the nature and use of questions, but mostly when it related to oral discourse or written language. A key emphasis for our study is the ancient philosophical understandings of questions in Hebraic and Greek language and culture. Unfortunately, the sources for study are somewhat limited.³ In contrast to what we can glean from the ancient world, modern theories of questions are far more pronounced, methodical and narrow-in-scope than ancient theories. Therefore, we will very briefly survey what little we know from the ancient world context and then turn to a survey of the modern context of questions. For the modern context, we will select only a few aspects that are both indicative of modern theories *and* significantly at odds with ancient perspectives on questions (so as to avoid anachronism). Of course, there is no way to do justice to these topics in such a short space; this is merely a selection of passing highlights.

Ancient Questions

Ancient Hebraic and ancient Greek contexts are both helpful for shedding light on the questions of Jesus in John. There are three guiding principles we can set in place to shape our study of ancient questions. The first is that the Hebraic context for questions is probably a little less clear than the Greek. More importantly, we need to be wary of popular assumptions about a ‘rabbinic’ disputation style in the Gospels. The second is that we must not underestimate the importance of rhetoric in shaping the Greek language—the way Greek was taught, learned and spoken. If we assume Greek was not the first language of the Fourth Evangelist, this assumption does not mean the basic Greek learned by the Evangelist to compose the gospel would be devoid of rhetorical concerns. On the contrary, we can say with certainty that rhetoric did play some role in the creation of the gospel narrative (John 20:31).⁴ The field of biblical studies has only slowly begun to recognize the depth of rhetorical emphasis in ancient Greek education, evidenced in Greek literature and *progymnasmata*. While it is

³ Many Greek works on questions and questioning have, sadly, not survived.

⁴ Ben Witherington, III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene: Cascade, 2009), 5; and George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Studies in Religion (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 97, 113.

possible to argue that a second-language adult learner of Greek—as many suppose the Evangelist was—would not master rhetorical strategy, it is not possible to argue that such a speaker would be unaware of rhetorical strategy, given the known emphasis placed on rhetoric in the teaching of the Greek language. And the third is that both ancient Hebraic and Greek approaches to questions target their use at skillful persuasion far more than modern theories. Their emphasis on persuasion is an important feature for understanding John's purpose in using questions.

Questions in Hebraic Context

The Hebraic context for interrogative use is perhaps the least articulated of any of the contexts we will consider. Unlike Greek academicians (and modern scholars), who discussed the use of questions as they related to language and philosophy, ancient Hebrew thinkers do not appear to share this interest (based on extant texts). Our only real understanding of the way ancient Hebraic thinkers and writers understood questions comes from their use and practice as evidenced in surviving texts. This includes the Old Testament, the literature of the Second Temple, and the Talmud. These ancient texts give us a good background for investigating Johannine question usage, especially given their philosophical and religious proximity to the Fourth Gospel.

Modern scholars have shown far more interest in the use of questions in the Old Testament, as opposed to the New Testament, but mostly along the lines of how questions function as a literary device in Old Testament texts.⁵ These studies of questions in the Old Testament are a good beginning, but they have some limitations for our purpose: They typically do not go beyond literary features nor interact with either ancient or modern erotetic theory. As in most languages, questions were a meaningful part of Hebrew dialogue. Questions were a form of deliberation in the Old Testament (1 Kings 10:1–3/2 Chronicles 9:1–3; cf. Luke 2:46) or a method of proving worth (Job 38:3, 40:7; cf. Matt 22:35). Questions in the Old Testament do not always follow a modern logic for language, at times resulting in misunderstandings over the degree or presence of interroga-

⁵ Perhaps the most notable example is Kenneth Craig, Jr.'s *Asking For Rhetoric: The Hebrew Bible's Protean Interrogative*; plus essays by OT scholars such as Walter Brueggemann, Adina Moshavi and Alan Cooper.

tivity in certain statements.⁶ A common use of questions throughout the Old Testament is what we can (for now) broadly label 'rhetorical'; examples include:

- He said to the woman, "Did God say, 'You shall not eat from any tree in the garden'?" (Gen 3:1, NRSV)
- I said of laughter, "It is mad," and of pleasure, "What use is it?" (Eccl 2:2, NRSV)
- "What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?" says the Lord. (Isa 1:11, NRSV)

One interesting correlation between the Old Testament and the Fourth Gospel is the high percentage of questions that possess noticeable rhetorical qualities. However, there are several stylistic differences (due to genre, audience, and more) between John's use and many of the Old Testament uses. Of course, there are many other types of questions in the books that comprise the Old Testament. Yet there can be little doubt that many of the Old Testament writers' heavy use of rhetorical questions played a role in shaping interrogative discourse of early Christian oratory and writing.

The use of questions in the Fourth Gospel is in many ways closer to the style of Second Temple Hebrew texts than to the Old Testament—with genre and composition playing an extremely important and determining role. For example, the book of Tobit utilizes questions in a way that often combines elements of conversation, argumentation and rhetoric within narrative dialogue that is, generally speaking, more closely related to the type of questions we find in the Fourth Gospel. Only in a few places does the text of Tobit still carry with it the 'feel' of the Old Testament in its styling of rhetorical questions (e.g., Tob 3:15). These kinds of rhetorical uses are pretty distinct from the average uses of questions in modern narrative. This is most notable in the less explicit audience/implied reader interaction found in modern dialogue; it is a direct result of biblical narrative speaking at the same time as if with both a human and divine voice to multiple audiences that causes this disconnect between ancient and modern uses of questions.⁷ This interactional tension shows up in the Fourth Gospel as well.

⁶ For example, see Robert Gordis, "A Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew," *AJS* 49:3 (1933): 214.

⁷ Samuel M. Edelman, "Ancient Traditions, Modern Needs: An Introduction to Jewish Rhetoric," *JCR* 26:2 (2003): 115; and cf. Craig, *Asking For Rhetoric*, 4.

The third major part of the ancient Hebraic context for understanding questions is the use of questions in rabbinic discourse, most specifically the Talmud. This is the context that much popular imagination about Jesus' use of questions fall into—these accounts typically depict Jesus as a Socratic-like rabbi skilled in an idealized form of Judean oratory. However, there are a number of flaws with this popular idea. For one, the Johannine Jesus was based on a product of the early 1st century; yet the Talmud, while it may possibly originate in as early as 1st or 2nd century thought, is received by us as a late 5th or early 6th century text. This late date—in contrast to the origin of the questions of Jesus—forces us to weigh heavily against relying on a rabbinic style as we consider the argumentation structure of the Talmud.⁸ For another, Jesus did not possess a 'rabbinic' style of asking questions because there is no such style; there are actually many different argumentative and discourse styles within rabbinic literature.⁹ Perhaps the most obvious example of this is the shift from a strongly persuasive use of the interrogative in earlier sections of the Talmud to a much more philosophical, truth-oriented focus of deliberation in the later, more developed sections of the Talmud.¹⁰ What is popularly referred to as the 'rabbinic' style of argumentation is present only in the Babylonian Talmud, which surfaces much later and in a much more refined form than what we find in the Jerusalem Talmud.¹¹ Consider this sugya on Sabbath restrictions from the Bavli:

And a scorpion, so that it will not bite:

Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "Whatever does injury may be killed on the Sabbath."

Objected R. Joseph, "Five things may be killed on the Sabbath, and these are they: a fly in Egypt, a hornet in Nineveh, a scorpion in Adiabene, a snake in the Land of Israel, and a mad dog anywhere." Now who is the Tannaite authority behind this position? Should I say it is R. Judah? Lo, he has said, 'For an act of labor that is not required for its own purpose, one is liable.' So isn't it R. Simeon? And these are the items that he has permitted to be killed, but others not?

⁸ Louis Jacobs, *The Talmudic Argument: A Study in Talmudic Reasoning and Methodology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 212; though cf. Christine Elizabeth Hayes, *Between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds: Accounting for Halakhic Difference in Selected Sugyot from Tractate Avodah Zarah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 11.

⁹ Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, response to Jacob Neusner, in "A Rabbinic Theory of Language?" by Jacob Neusner and Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, *JAAR* 56:4 (1988): 763.

¹⁰ Edelman, "Ancient Traditions, Modern Needs," 116.

¹¹ Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *The Culture of The Babylonian Talmud* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 3–5.

Said R. Jeremiah, "So who is going to tell us that this version is well set forth? Maybe it's corrupt?"

Said R. Joseph, "So I'm the one who repeated the Tannaite tradition, and I'm the one who raised the question, and I'm the one who can then work out the solution: It speaks of a case in which they were running after a person, and it represents the position of all parties." (b. Šabb. 121b, Neusner)

Examples such as this one reveal a highly disciplined and carefully orchestrated style of interrogation not present in the Fourth Gospel (nor, for reasons of genre, should we expect it to be).¹² Of course, since there was no punctuation in the original versions of the Talmud, it is at times difficult to know whether some sentences are questions at all, or just challenging assertions.¹³

There is a still bigger question we must ask: Where did the so-called 'rabbinic' style we see in later Talmudic texts come from? What culture(s) influenced it? By the first century, much of Hebraic philosophical thought had become very Hellenized, even in Palestine.¹⁴ One part of this Hellenization process was the assimilation of Greek rhetoric into the language, which formed the basis for the Greek educational system. Therefore, it is probable that Hebraic rhetoric, as in the Talmud, has as its primary basis Greek rhetoric.¹⁵ Many of the rabbis debated in a style that has its origins with Socrates and Aristotle.¹⁶ This is not to say that rabbinic rhetoric was a carbon copy of Greek rhetoric; a major difference between the two systems is that Hebraic deliberation did not make time for sophistic wanderings (questioning for the sake of questioning). Instead it remained laser-focused on discerning the truth within the debate.¹⁷

¹² Jacobs, *Talmudic Argument*, 143, 211.

¹³ Moses Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud: Historical and Literary Introduction* (Cincinnati: Bloch, 1894), 65.

¹⁴ Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942), 66–67; and Witherington, *New Testament Rhetoric*, 23.

¹⁵ Richard Hidary, "Classical Rhetorical Arrangement and Reasoning in the Talmud: The Case of Yerushalmi Berakhot 1:1," *AJS Review* 34:1 (2010): 33.

¹⁶ Jacob Neusner, *Jerusalem and Athens: The Congruity of Talmudic and Classical Philosophy*, JSJSup 52 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 6, 17; and Jacob Howland, *Plato and the Talmud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 11–12.

¹⁷ Hidary, "Classical Rhetorical Arrangement," 64; and cf. Rebecca Bensen Cain, *The Socratic Method: Plato's Use of Philosophical Drama*, CSAP (London: Continuum, 2007), 109; plus there were different philosophical presuppositions and goals between Rabbinic and Greek argumentation; see David A. Frank, "Arguing with God, Talmudic Discourse, and the Jewish Countermodel: Implications for the Study of Argumentation," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 41 (2004): 82.

As a result, if we want to understand the context of the questions of Jesus in John, it will largely be found in a Hellenized context.

Questions in Greco-Roman Context

As questions in Greco-Roman context were more developed and discussed than in Hebraic context, it is probably one of the reasons that Hellenized Judeans and Jews—which includes authors of both the New Testament and the Talmud—borrowed from it in the way that they did. More than likely Greek influence was inescapable due to the ways and means of language acquisition in the ancient world. At the same time, there are several important differences between the use of questions in a more classical Greek context and in the Fourth Gospel. Our brief examples of questions from a Hebraic context are akin to their use in the New Testament, but many of the examples from formal Greek usage were not as related.

Nothing extant prior to the 4th century BC reveals any technical discussion of questions, argumentation or rhetoric,¹⁸ although Quintilian credited Protagoras with introducing sentential logic and it is arguable that Aristotle credited Zeno of Elea (c. 490–454 BC) with founding *dialectic*, the basis of Greek questioning.¹⁹ All this changed with Socrates, who believed questions were useful in leading people to greater understanding.²⁰ So famously did Socrates ask questions that eventually almost every instance of questioning in a learning environment in the West is now dubbed a part of the ‘Socratic method.’²¹ Unfortunately, Socrates’ real relationship with questions is much more complex than recognized in popular perception. He is known to have questioned questions, and in the course of answering a question from Meno set up one of the modern ideals for interrogative use:

Do you see what a captious argument you are introducing—that, forsooth, a man cannot inquire either about what he knows or about what he does not know? For he cannot inquire about what he knows, because he knows it, and in that case is in no need of inquiry; nor again can he inquire about

¹⁸ David M. Timmerman and Edward Schiappa, *Classical Greek Rhetorical Theory and the Disciplining of Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 145.

¹⁹ As referenced in Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 8.57, 9.25; and Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.4.10, respectively.

²⁰ Robert R. Wellman, “Socratic Method in Xenophon,” *JHI* 37:2 (1976): 315.

²¹ Gary Alan Scott, introduction to *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato’s Dialogues and Beyond*, ed. Gary Alan Scott (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 16; and cf. Demetrius, *Eloc.* 297.

what he does not know, since he does not know about what he is to inquire. (Plato, *Meno* 80e, LCL)

In response to Meno's paradox, Socrates was the first to recognize that the questions one asks are conditioned by what one knows.²² While questions were an integral part of Socrates' pedagogical technique,²³ there is no evidence that Socrates held to a clearly delineated method.²⁴ His standard approach was a question and answer discussion (διαλέγεσθαι).²⁵

At this point, let me interject a related word of warning: Most of the technical terms used in Greek rhetoric do not have universally agreed upon definitions or uses. It is very common to see these words used by scholars in different ways in the secondary literature.²⁶ Moreover, many of the ancient Greek rhetoricians did not agree on the meaning of these technical terms either.²⁷ The best we can usually hope for is to observe the way questions were used. We should also be cautious about the particular usage of questions in many Greek dialogues; many of the prominent uses for questions occurred in legal or judicial contexts—contexts that are not very close to the context of the questions of Jesus in John.²⁸

We can gain insight into Socrates' view of questions by contrasting him with his antagonists, the Sophists. Sophists were popularly credited with long-winded speeches that could confuse the listener.²⁹ Socrates believed

²² Meno's paradox has long served as a philosophical riddle, but Socrates does explain the way out of the impasse is to have faith in the asking (Plato, *Meno* 86b–c); see Dominic Scott, *Plato's Meno*, CSDP (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 76–83. Aristotle's interests brought him to a different conclusion; see Aristotle, *Soph. Elench.* 172a23–29.

²³ Gary Alan Scott, *Plato's Socrates as Educator*, SUNY Series in Ancient Greek Philosophy (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 44.

²⁴ Scott, introduction to *Does Socrates Have a Method?* 2.

²⁵ Eugenio Benitez, "Argument, Rhetoric, and Philosophic Method: Plato's 'Protagoras,'" *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25:3 (1992): 239; and cf. Charles H. Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 303.

²⁶ Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), xv; Benitez, "Argument, Rhetoric, and Philosophic Method," 251; and cf. Scott, introduction to *Does Socrates Have a Method?* 2.

²⁷ David C. Mirhady, "The Disappearance and Reappearance of *Exetasis*," *Mouseion* 8:3 (2008): 405–6; plus Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.99.

²⁸ For example, ἐξέτασις and some forms of ἐρώτησις; see George A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 246–47; Mirhady, "Disappearance and Reappearance of *Exetasis*," 400; and E. M. Carawan, "Erotesis: Interrogation in the Courts of Fourth-Century Athens," *GRBS* 24:3 (1983): 209–26.

²⁹ For example, Plato, *Prot.* 335c; Aristophanes, *Av.* 428–31; and cf. Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue*, 120. Sophists were also known to use eristic (ἐριστικός) or verbal battles (ἀγών λόγων) with questions as a form of back and forth debate technique; see Benitez,

that the best weapon against a Sophist's speech was a question.³⁰ He was often portrayed by Plato as someone asking questions to bring forth wisdom from others rather than to assert his own opinions.³¹ Socrates' process of examining a statement (or a person) for its worth was *elenchus* (ἐλεγχος), which today we would refer to as a cross-examination or a testing of a person to see if their arguments hold water.³² In return, the typical sophistic rhetorical tactic for questions was to use them as a chisel to force the speaker's opinion or ideas into the dialogue.³³

Plato followed in the footsteps of his teacher Socrates when it came to questions, though Favorinus (c. AD 80–160) credits Plato with being the first philosopher to actually develop argumentation strategy through question and answer.³⁴ There is evidence Plato was more systematized in his approach to questioning, starting a shift away from Socrates' penchant for informality.³⁵ In fact, due to Plato's treatment of Socrates, the Platonic dialogues may actually have served to push attention away from the questioning and toward the answers.³⁶ Whether intentional or not—and I suspect the move from a more oral to a more textual culture also influenced this greatly—Plato's turn from question to answer was taken

"Argument, Rhetoric, and Philosophic Method," 244; and Alexander Nehamas, "Eristic, Antilogic, Sophistic, Dialectic: Plato's Demarcation of Philosophy from Sophistry," *HPQ* 7:1 (1990): 5.

³⁰ Plato, *Prot.* 329a–b; and cf. Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning," 288.

³¹ McCoy, *Plato on the Rhetoric of Philosophers and Sophists*, 144–45.

³² Plato, *Apol.* 29e; Sara Rubinielli, *Ars Topica: The Classical Technique of Constructing Arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*, AL 15 (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), 35; Gregory Vlastos, "The Socratic *Elenchus*," *JPhil* 79:11 (1982): 711–12; George B. Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 5; Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue*, 90, 111, 133; Walton, *Media Argumentation*, 214; and Hayden W. Ausland, "Forensic Characteristics of Socratic Argumentation," in *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato's Dialogues and Beyond*, ed. Gary Alan Scott (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 37. Prior to Plato, the term *elenchus* probably meant aggressive questioning or interrogation to reveal deception in others; see Louis-André Dorion, "La subversion de l' 'elenchos' juridique dans l' 'Apologie de Socrate'," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 88:3 (1990): 311–344. Either the constructivist or nonconstructivist account of Socrates' *elenchus* works for my argument.

³³ Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning," 281.

³⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 3.24; Han Baltussen, "Dialectic in Dialogue: The Message of Plato's *Protagoras* and Aristotle's *Topics*," in *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, *Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* 7, MNS 298 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 205; and Scott, *Plato's Socrates*, 44.

³⁵ Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue*, 302; Timmerman and Schiappa, *Classical Greek Rhetorical Theory*, 23; and cf. Baltussen, "Dialectic in Dialogue," 207–208.

³⁶ Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning," 281, 285.

to a new level in Aristotle, impacting the way we consider questions in the West even today.

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, the consequence of Aristotle's elevation of answers, propositions, truth and ontology resulted in him moving questions from the front seat to the back seat of philosophy.³⁷ Aristotle also differentiated the use of questions from propositions in education, rhetoric, and in poetics, and largely downplayed their usefulness (at least in comparison to his predecessors).³⁸ Questions had become a "shadow" of their former, Socratic existence.³⁹ Is it possible Aristotle's approach to questions was a reaction against the question-heavy tradition of Plato and Socrates? This is a distinct possibility—though it is equally possible that Aristotle's interests in the scientific methods and mechanisms of the world compelled him to take a different approach.⁴⁰ Aristotle's primary use for questions was not rhetorical (which he described sophistically) but dialectical,⁴¹ in that he viewed dialectic as a philosophical exercise for students involving a proponent with a thesis and an antagonist armed with yes/no questions.⁴² As with many modern theories of questions, however, Aristotle's theory is guilty of being compatible only with simple, and not complex, theses.⁴³

In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle suggests six possible uses for questions, but the context is primarily legal/judicial.⁴⁴ And in *Poetics*, Aristotle argues questions are best left to the field of rhetoric and performance rather than poetics and narrative (to which we will respectfully disagree).⁴⁵ This idea is echoed in a few other sections of his works.⁴⁶ At times, Aristotle even

³⁷ Aristotle, *Int.* 17a1–8; and cf. Aristotle, *Poet.* 1456a33–1456b19.

³⁸ Cf. Aristotle, *Top.* 159a25–39.

³⁹ Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning," 287.

⁴⁰ Karl Schuhmann and Barry Smith, "Questions: An Essay in Daubertian Phenomenology," *PPR* 47:3 (1987): 375.

⁴¹ Kennedy, *New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 56–57.

⁴² Aristotle, *Top.* 155b3–160a34; Aristotle, *Int.* 20b22–30; W. W. Fortenbaugh, "Aristotle's *Art of Rhetoric*," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington, BCAW (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 108; Kennedy, *New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 52; and cf. Aristotle, *An. post.* 77a32–34.

⁴³ The tendency of eroteticians to deal only with simplistic question examples is a substantial weakness in this field; see for example, Henry Hiž, "Questions and Answers," *JPhil* 59:10 (1962): 257; and Sylvain Bromberger, "Questions," *JPhil* 63:20 (1966): 598.

⁴⁴ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1419a.

⁴⁵ Aristotle, *Poet.* 1456a33–1456b19; and contra Aelius Theon, *Progymn.* §5; Hermogenes, *Progymn.* §2; and Nicolaus the Sophist, *Progymn.* §3.

⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Top.* 155b3–160a34; and Aristotle, *Int.* 20b24–30.

seemed to argue that questioning was not a useful educational strategy.⁴⁷ He also favored the use of the *enthymeme* (ἐνθυμημα), which a speaker could cast as a question for greater impact.⁴⁸ Aristotle tackles questions in one final discussion that is probably the most germane to our interest in the questions of Jesus in John. In developing his logical theory, Aristotle argues there are four kinds of questions:

There are four kinds of question that we ask, and they correspond to the kinds of things that we know. They are: the question of fact (τὸ ὅτι), the question of reason or cause (τὸ διότι), the question of existence (εἰ ἔστι), and the question of essence (τί ἐστίν). (1) When we ask whether this or that is so, introducing a plurality of terms (*e.g.*, whether the sun suffers eclipse or not), we are asking the question of fact. The proof is that when we have discovered that it does suffer eclipse our inquiry is finished; and if we know at the outset that it does so, we do not ask whether it does. It is when we know the fact that we ask (2) the reason; *e.g.*, if we know that the sun suffers eclipse and that the earth moves, we ask the reasons for these facts. That is how we ask these questions; but there are others which take a different form: *e.g.* (3) whether a centaur or a god exists. The question of existence refers to simple existence, and not to whether the subject is (say) white or not. When we know that the subject exists, we ask (4) what it is; *e.g.*, “what, then, is a god?” or “a man?” (Aristotle, *An. post.* 89b23–35, LCL)

These four kinds of questions—albeit with some modifications—are still representative of the differentiations made by logicians, rhetoricians and philosophers of questions today.

Beyond Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, I will very briefly mention a few other contributors from the ancient Greek world. The most important of these is the influence of the various *progymnasmata*—basic textbooks and exercises on rhetoric. These handbooks considered interrogative use in narrative to be commonplace.⁴⁹ Anecdotes (χρεια), a very popular form of rhetoric in the first-century and used to some degree in the

⁴⁷ Although there is a degree of inconsistency across Aristotle's many works, plus the occasional reminders of his Socratic and Platonic philosophical origins; see Jonathan Barnes, “Aristotle's Theory of Demonstration,” *Phronesis* 14:2 (1969): 141–2.

⁴⁸ Thomas M. Conley, “The Enthymeme in Perspective,” *QJS* 70:2 (1984): 171. As time passed from Aristotle's day, speakers and writers cast enthymemes more often as questions than as propositions; see David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 156.

⁴⁹ Aelius Theon, *Progymn.* §5; Hermogenes, *Progymn.* §2; Nicolaus the Sophist, *Progymn.* §3; and Craig A. Gibson, *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 27 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 9.

writing of the gospels, were often set-up or introduced by questions.⁵⁰ In the rhetorical handbook *On the Method of Forceful Speaking*, attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus (fl. late 2nd century AD), we are told a speaker can use questions in three directions—toward the opponent to rebut, toward the speaker to engender approval from the audience, and toward the audience for dressing them down.⁵¹ Hermogenes also believed a question was a useful way to climactically punctuate a logical argument (e.g., in a *plaston epicheireme*, πλαστον ἐπιχείρημα).⁵² Additionally, a number of ancient writers such as Euripides (c. 484–c. 406 BC), Aristophanes (c. 445–c. 385 BC), Chariton (fl. first century AD), Plutarch (c. AD 46–c. 121), and the unknown author of the *Letter to Diognetus* (late first century AD) employed questions in a variety of ways to shape their texts.⁵³ Longinus (fl. first century AD) devotes a chapter of his *On the Sublime* to the emotional potential of questions in narrative context.⁵⁴

Finally, two Roman orators and one writer in the liberal arts bear mentioning if only due to their close proximity in time to the writing of the Fourth Gospel. Marcus Cicero (106–43 BC), statesman and orator, and Marcus Quintilian (35–c. 95 AD), rhetorician and lawyer, wrote about the use of questions primarily in legal and judicial contexts. In order to contextualize their arguments, a little background: The early speechwriter Antiphon from Rhamnous (c. 480–411 BC) wrote an educational collection of speeches that argued both sides (prosecution and defense) for the same legal cases in order for the reader to learn how to properly come to the issue-in-question (στάσις).⁵⁵ After further development in Anaximenes of Lampsacus' (fl. 380–320 BC) *Rhetoric to Alexander* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*,⁵⁶ Hermagoras of Temnos (fl. second century BC) developed the

⁵⁰ Hermogenes, *Progymn.* §3; John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* §4; and Gibson, *Libanius's Progymnasmata*, 43.

⁵¹ Hermogenes, *Meth.* 425.15–426.10 (George A. Kennedy, *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 15 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 220–3).

⁵² Hermogenes, *Inv.* 159.1–162.3 (Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, 114–19).

⁵³ For example, Aristophanes, *Nub.*; Chariton, *Chaer.*; Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.*; and *Diogn.*

⁵⁴ Longinus, *Subl.* 18.

⁵⁵ Malcolm Heath, "Codifications of Rhetoric," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, ed. Erik Gunderson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 64; and Michael Gagarin, "The Tetralogies" in *Antiphon and Andocides*, trans. Michael Gagarin and Douglas M. MacDowell, *The Oratory of Classical Greece* 1 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 17.

⁵⁶ Anaximenes, *Rhet. Alex.* 1427a22–30; and Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1416a6–20, respectively; and Heath, "Codifications of Rhetoric," 64. For a sharp contrast to this conventional view, see Yameng Liu, "Aristotle and the Stasis Theory: A Reexamination," *RSQ* 21:1 (1991): 53–59.

stasis theory—a method for getting to the issue-in-question—in his non-extant handbook of rhetoric.⁵⁷ In their development of a theory of questions, Cicero and Quintilian were largely indebted to the antecedent work of Hermagoras.⁵⁸ When it came to argumentation, Cicero and Quintilian divided questions into three degrees of complexity: the simple (*simplex*), the complex (*coniuncta*), and the comparative (*comparativa*).⁵⁹ They also distinguished between two classes of questions: limited questions (*causa*; also *quaestio finita* or *hypothesis*, ὑποθέσεις) and unlimited questions (*thesis*, θέσεις; also *quaestio infinita*).⁶⁰ Limited questions dealt with particular issues and were well-suited for the work of a lawyer (e.g. “Should Nadine buy a new car?”); whereas unlimited questions were more the realm of the philosopher (e.g. “Do leprechauns exist?”).⁶¹ As with many rhetoricians, Cicero frequently utilized rhetorical questions (*interrogatio*) in his orations to connect emotionally (via *pathos*) with his listeners.⁶² Over the course of his life he came to a greater appreciation of general questions with regard to their power for oratorical ornamentation.⁶³ Likewise Quintilian reminded his readers that questions were not primarily for

⁵⁷ Kennedy, *New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 97; Ruth Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2009), 132; and Joy Connolly, *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 69–70.

⁵⁸ Though not in the same way; Cicero was often critical of Hermagoras and Quintilian was often positive.

⁵⁹ The simple question centers on one clear-cut issue (“Who stole Violet’s tiara?”), the complex question involves either multiple simple questions or on different issues (“Did the thief steal from Violet and Bridget?”), and the comparative question compares alternatives (“Does Violet or Bridget deserve the recovered tiara?”). See Cicero, *Inv.* 1.17; Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.10.1–3; and Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson, trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 39.

⁶⁰ Cicero, *Part. Or.* 60; Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.5.5–18; and Lausberg, *Handbook*, 39–41; and cf. Cicero, *Inv.* 1.8; Cicero, *De Or.* 3.116–17.

⁶¹ James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2001), 107; although cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.5.12. Cicero and Quintilian subdivided *causa* and *thesis* into multiple types of questions; see Elaine Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero’s De Oratore* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 258.

⁶² For example, Cicero, *Cat.* 1.1; Kimberly Anne Barber, *Rhetoric in Cicero’s Pro Balbo: An Interpretation*, Studies in Classics 6 (London: Routledge, 2004), 30; and Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 84. Depending on context, *interrogatio* can mean rhetorical questions (rhetoric) as well as interrogation (legal). Rhetoricians also sometimes labeled rhetorical questions as ἐρωτησεις, ἐπερωτήσεις or even πύσμα. In contrast, Augustine limits *interrogatio* to polar questions; see Augustine, *Doctr. Chr.* 3.3.6.

⁶³ M. L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*, rev ed. (London: Routledge, 1996), 58; and this was true in his own writing; see Michael von Albrecht, *Cicero’s Style: A Synopsis*, MNS 245 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 109.

information; they have many rhetorical uses such as to put “fire” into our communication.⁶⁴ The third Roman, Marcus Varro (116–27 BC), was a prolific author whose works include the substantial *On the Latin Language*, wherein he barely mentions the interrogative, noting only that in Latin the question is hard to distinguish grammatically.⁶⁵

There are several notables as we reflect on the Greco-Roman context of questions for a first-century gospel writer. The first and most obvious is context; the questions of interest to Aristotle and Cicero reflect challenges in politics and law and not general linguistic principles nor Israelite religious regulations. Unlike the sometimes life and death situations facing the earliest followers of Jesus’ teaching, rhetoricians taught their students to use questions with some degree of ἐπιστηκός—to score points against opponent orators and to argue both sides of the case.⁶⁶ These are sizeable differences, but the tie that binds the two together is rhetoric. Rhetoric goes beyond grammar or conventions; at its heart is the movement of others via persuasion.⁶⁷ A second notable is that many common uses of questions remain unchanged between contexts: Often they are used to gain information, but equally as often, questions are used by speakers to persuade and influence listeners in a way declarations are not able to do. In many instances they accomplish both. As such, we see that the testimony of the Fourth Gospel reveals the Johannine Jesus to be an experienced orator (at least in a general sense of the term).

Modern Questions

If we are to profitably consider the questions of Jesus in John, the second context for our study of questions is modern logic and linguistics. Whereas we can trace the ancient study of questions to the rhetorical traditions of Socrates and Plato, we can likewise trace the modern study of questions to the writings of Gottlob Frege.⁶⁸ Just as we addressed some of the concerns with reading Socratic ideas into Johannine thought, so too

⁶⁴ Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.8; and cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.6–16.

⁶⁵ Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 9.32.

⁶⁶ For example, Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1419a; Hermogenes, *Inv.* 193.2–3; and Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.1.35.

⁶⁷ Jennifer Richards, *Rhetoric*, The New Critical Idiom (London: Routledge, 2008), 159.

⁶⁸ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 71. The only exception to this may be the phenomenological approach.

must we make ourselves aware of several peculiarities in modern theories of questions in our reading of John.

The father of modern question theory, Gottlob Frege, was a mathematician turned logician. He is most well-known for his pioneering work in mathematical logic and philosophy of language, as well as being one of the founders of modern logic and analytic philosophy. Frege's work on questions comes out of his interest in mathematics, and his spin on erotetic logic is very different than ancient perspectives. Due to Frege's influence, many studies on questions (regardless of field) tend to emphasize reducibility, literalness, answers and truth conditions. Following Frege was a number of philosophers such as Felix Cohen and Rudolf Carnap, both of whom emphasized similar values to Frege in the study of questions.

Earlier in this chapter I noted that many example questions used in the study of questions are more simplistic than questions that occur in natural conversations or narrative texts. We now understand a reason for this—in order to get at the logic of questions, many of the pioneers of the study of questions bracketed out pragmatic concerns completely.⁶⁹ Their goal was to reduce questions to the simplest definable operators. However, the problem with this is severe: A logic of questions that excludes pragmatics is an artificial logic and useful only in very narrow applications. The same holds true in reverse: A pragmatic theory of questions must address semantics and syntax. Whereas most studies of the logic of questions only address logical questions, human questions from text or tongue are often not 'logical' in this way. Certainly many are not as simple or straightforward as the sample questions used in linguistic and logical studies. For example, merely asking, "What is a question?" is not resolvable or addressable in many logical question theories.⁷⁰ Therefore, while the logic of questions is a very useful tool, the field has not developed to the point where we can easily apply it to a text like the Fourth Gospel. There are three additional issues related to modern question studies we'll need to keep in mind: answers, truth conditions, and conversation.

Questions and Answers

Modern theories of questions frequently emphasize the *answer* to a question more than the question itself. From infancy, one of the ways

⁶⁹ Cf. Richard A. Hudson, "The Meaning of Questions," *Language* 51:1 (1975): 24.

⁷⁰ Cf. Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1108.

we learn to communicate is through the question-answer pair.⁷¹ In this sense, answers are an important part of questioning. Question theorists, however, often speak of an *answer* as the proposition that completes a question and a *reply* as anything said in response to a question (whether or not it is an answer).⁷² In this line of thinking, a question is an incomplete sentence-form that is only completed by its answer—and therefore the answer is to some degree in its nature a part of the question.⁷³ By speaking of a question this way, questions create partitions of possible worlds in their asking.⁷⁴ This has led to a debate as to whether a question has many possible answers or one ‘true’ answer.⁷⁵ Many modern theorists go so far as to argue a question is meaningless or useless if it does not have an answer.⁷⁶ The consequence of this view is that questions cannot be studied apart from their answers.⁷⁷ This presupposition, however, is not sustainable in either natural discourse or narrative texts because many questions are either unanswerable or simply not answered.⁷⁸ Therefore, it

⁷¹ Sarles, *Language and Human Nature*, 175; and Seuren, *Logic of Language*, 386.

⁷² David Harrah, “The Logic of Questions,” in *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, 2nd ed., ed. Dov M. Gabbay and F. Guenther (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002), 8:1; Douglas Walton, *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument*, TSP (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1998), 137; and cf. Rodney Huddleston, “The Contrast between Interrogatives and Questions,” *Journal of Linguistics* 30.2 (1994): 413.

⁷³ Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1079; Gerold Stahl, “The Effectivity of Questions,” *Noûs* 3:2 (1969): 211; Walter Fales, “The Phenomenology of Questions,” *PPR* 4:1 (1943–44): 60; and cf. Bernard Mayo, “Deliberative Questions: A Criticism,” *Analysis* 16:3 (1956): 58.

⁷⁴ Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1079; and Han, “Interpreting Interrogatives,” 210.

⁷⁵ Proponents of many answers include: Ginzburg, “Interrogatives,” 401; and proponents of one ideal answer include: Robert M. Harnish, “Frege on Mood and Force,” in *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse: A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*, ed. István Kenesei and Robert M. Harnish (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), 210. Also, different types of questions tend toward many answers or one ideal answer, see Nuel D. Belnap, Jr., “S-P Interrogatives,” *JPL* 1:3/4 (1972): 333.

⁷⁶ Theodore Sider, “On the Paradox of the Question,” *Analysis* 57:2 (1997): 99; Fales, “Phenomenology of Questions,” 62; Ledger Wood, *The Analysis of Knowledge* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941), 254; cf. Nuel D. Belnap, Jr. and Thomas B. Steel, Jr., *The Logic of Questions and Answers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 35; and G. P. Henderson, “On Questions,” *Philosophy* 30:115 (1955): 316. In contrast, it is possible to argue the reverse, that a proposition is meaningless without knowing what question solicited it; see Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 100–1.

⁷⁷ Gerald A. Sanders, “On the Natural Domain of Grammar,” in *Indiana Linguistics Reprint* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962), 38–40.

⁷⁸ John Heritage and Steven Clayman, *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 23; and contra Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness, Routledge Classics (London: Routledge, 2001), 88.

is quite possible (and often necessary) to study questions without studying their answers.⁷⁹

It would be hard to overstate the importance of answers within modern theories of questions, but such focus often has the added consequence of denigrating most or all pragmatic concerns (such as silence, non-answers, questions not meant to be answered, and many more). Outside of simplistic test cases, many questions in natural discourse simply do not have answers (in the sense of a proposition that completes the question). If one approaches questions as they are and occur naturally, rather than as a construct, then a question in natural discourse can only be related to what precedes it and not what follows it.⁸⁰ It is, of course, possible to construct a narrative question from its answer, but this is not typical nor indicative of an ancient gospel writing style. A related problem is that many questions change with context.⁸¹ For example, the question “What is an apple?” can have very different (and true!) answers when asked of a child (a fruit), a seminary student (a symbol of original sin), a botanist (a pome of the *Malus domestica*) or a computer user (a trendy, overpriced piece of hardware). As a result, it is not accurate to say every question has a definitive answer, as the answers to some questions will change with the circumstances and context of the questions.⁸²

Questions and Truth

Another distinctive aspect of modern theories of questions is their struggle with *truth*. Western tradition, jumpstarted by Aristotle with the recent push by Frege, holds that questions cannot be true or false since questions do not make statements.⁸³ At first blush this will seem accurate to modern readers. How can “How many toys does Sitka have?” be true or false? However, there is more to this question than first meets the eye. Questions do not make statements, but they do ask questions that

⁷⁹ Richard Zuber, *Non-Declarative Sentences*, Pragmatics & Beyond 4:2 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983), 46.

⁸⁰ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 235.

⁸¹ Scott A. Kleiner, “Erotetic Logic and Scientific Inquiry,” *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 44–45; Jacob Mey, “Linguistics as a Practical Science,” in *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics: Festschrift for Winfred P. Lehmann*, ed. Paul J. Hopper, CILT 4 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1977), 246–47; and H. G. Widdowson, *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 37.

⁸² Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 14, 19.

⁸³ Harnish, “Frege on Mood and Force,” 204; and Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 68.

define subsequent statements.⁸⁴ One way we can observe the meaning of a question is to see them act as a partition that divides possible worlds (answers), and in this way the question takes on a value similar to the way a proposition possesses a value.⁸⁵ To put it another way, questions may not contain truth but they make the conditions that allow for truth. An obvious example of this is the use of questions in a legal context. In court, questions are the primary tool to separate what is true from what is false.⁸⁶ This is a function that is unavailable to propositions; questions therefore are necessary for determining truth even if they are not ontologically true or false themselves.

The ramifications of the relationship between questions and truth are limited for our study since the truth conditions many readers of the Fourth Gospel are interested in are different from this technical understanding of truth conditions. The truth conditions of questions assist us in understanding what is true and false in light of the logic of the question, not whether a question is verifiable to one source or speaker. From a linguistic point of view, the truth conditions of questions are directly related to their answers, and many of the questions in John are primarily meant to either encourage dialogue, to persuade via rhetorical effect, or do not have ideal answers. As with any narrative, some of the truth conditions of questions asked in narrative may not be indicative of or equitable to truth conditions in the real world.

Questions and Speech

The third and final peculiarity of modern research into questions is the tension between questions and speech. While initial approaches to questions from the mid-twentieth century were highly semantic in nature, many recent inquiries are highly pragmatic in their approach. As a result, a few ideas have crept into modern theories of questions that will not work well

⁸⁴ As above, I am speaking generally; rhetorical questions are often declaratives in question form and make statements and have some truth value.

⁸⁵ James Higginbotham explains: "We have the intuition that questions do not have truth values... Just as a declarative form has a truth value, and expresses an intension whose value in each possible world is a truth value, so an interrogative form has a value in the realm of partitions, and expresses an intension whose value in each possible world is a partition. An interrogative form is suited to asking a question, because it presents a space of possibilities"; see James Higginbotham, "The Semantics of Questions," in *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, edited by Shalom Lappin (London: Blackwell, 1997), 375, 382.

⁸⁶ Although, contra Quintilian; see Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.2.34.

in the investigation of an ancient text. One such problem is the assumption that a question must be asked to be a valid question.⁸⁷ Questions embedded in narrative are not asked as such, and they are often read without precise interrogative force. We can criticize this assumption further, since questions that are either unstated or hypothetical within a person's mind are still questions.⁸⁸ Many of the current pragmatic approaches are still tied to answers; for example, the conversation analysis approach to questions sees questions and answers as linked.⁸⁹ This is true in normal conversation but care must be taken when applied to narrative texts, including texts that represent (or are representative of) normal conversations. The conversation approach often implicitly assumes that questions primarily function to gain information, but as we will see in Chapter 3, this is only minimally accurate. Many of these information-seeking questions are simple, whereas questions in narrative are not limited to simple forms. The questions of Jesus in John occur in a narrative context, but are often not easily answered as many have a noticeable rhetorical quality.

⁸⁷ For example, Gilbert Ryle, "If,' 'So' and 'Because,'" in *Philosophical Analysis: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Max Black (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), 245; and contra Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, 2:328.

⁸⁸ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 85; and Schuhmann and Smith, "Questions," 372.

⁸⁹ Emanuel A. Schegloff and Harvey Sacks, "Opening Up Closings," *Semiotica* 7 (1973): 297–98; and Liddicoat, *Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, 106.

CHAPTER THREE

HOW QUESTIONS WORK

Pardon me, My Maker, for such awful questions.
—John Adams

Questions are diabolical. Just when you think you can define a question, you realize you cannot. “What is a question?” is easy to ask but impossible to answer.¹ Dictionaries define a question using question-words and offer many examples of the way the word can be used but fail to offer much insight into what the word actually means. As with words such as ‘time’ and ‘being,’ the word ‘question’ refers to something elementary yet not well understood. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, half of the problem is that propositions—not questions—are the basis for Western thinking. We have little formal training in thinking-to-ask, since the basis of our educational system is thinking-to-say. The other half of the problem is that questions are more slippery than statements, making it harder to get a hold on them.² Likewise, erotetic logic is arguably more complex than propositional logic.³ At its root, propositional (or specifically, alethic) thinking is *binary* (true or false) whereas interrogative logic is by nature *modal* (multiple possibilities). Add to this the fact that the modern study of questions is a recent phenomenon that spans a wide variety of fields: logic, linguistics, rhetoric, discourse and conversation analysis, philosophy, and psychology. As a result, there is no simple definition for questions. However, in order to better understand the questions of Jesus in John, we must first try to get some type of hold on what questions are and how they work.

¹ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 62; and cf. David Harrah, “What Should We Teach About Questions?” *Synthese* 51:1 (1982): 31.

² André Leclerc, “Verbal Moods and Sentence Moods in the Tradition of Universal Grammar,” in *Essays in Speech Act Theory*, ed. Daniel Vanderveken and Susumu Kubo, P&BNS 77 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), 80; and cf. Lauri Carlson, *Dialogue Games: An Approach to Discourse Analysis*, SLL (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1985), 24.

³ David Harrah defines erotetic logic as the theory of “questions, interrogatives, and the use of interrogatives” as well as “all the sentences (interrogative, imperative, declarative, or whatever) that call for reply, or that are vulnerable to replies of certain sorts, and the theory of all the entities that can thus be called for”; see Harrah, “Logic of Questions,” 8:2.

Questions vs. Questions

We'll need to fence questions in a little to delineate our area of study. The phenomenologist Johannes Daubert (1877–1947) believed there were three primary aspects of the nature of questions: the asking-thought that occurs in the mind (*das Fragen*), the asking-object that is heard or read (*die Frage*), and the asking-event that we perform in life (*die Anfrage*).⁴ Since our interest is in questions within a narrative, we will focus primarily on questions that occur in linguistic form within a written text (*die Frage*), and use the word 'question' to refer to this aspect of the interrogative idea. To put it another way in English, we will focus on *questions*, and not on *questioning* (neither the thought of nor the act of), although these fences are both artificial and porous. We will discover the way questions function as sentence-types in texts within the questioning process and examine their narrative and linguistic function to see how the Fourth Evangelist uses questions in logical and rhetorical ways.

To have better precision as we talk about questions, we also must contrast questions with interrogatives. An *interrogative* is not the same thing as a question, although they often have similar meanings and people use them in similar ways.⁵ When we speak of questions, we are primarily emphasizing the object of the illocutionary act; whereas when we speak of interrogatives, we are primarily emphasizing the force of the illocutionary act.⁶ This is the reason why some sentences *look* like questions but don't ask anything; these sentences lack interrogative force. One of the most celebrated examples—and one that we will explore in greater depth below—is the *rhetorical question*. According to conventional wisdom,

⁴ Schuhmann and Smith, "Questions," 359. Though highly-regarded by his peers, Daubert is not a well-known philosopher due to his unwillingness to publish during his lifetime; his work survives in obscurely formatted notes deciphered by Karl Schuhmann. Groenendijk and Stokhof also ascribe a tripartite nature to questions albeit in a slightly different way than Daubert; see Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1057; and cf. Higginbotham, "Semantics of Questions," 361.

⁵ Harrah, "Logic of Questions," 81; Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1057; Michel Meyer and Marlene L. Cushman, "Argumentation in the Light of a Theory of Questioning," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 15:2 (1982): 83; William G. Moulton, "On the Prosody of Statements, Questions, and Echo Questions," *American Speech* 62:3 (1987): 249; and cf. Douglas Walton, "New Directions in the Logic of Dialogue," *Synthese* 63:3 (1985): 272.

⁶ Cf. Belnap and Steel, *Logic of Questions and Answers*, 3.

a rhetorical question appears in the form of a question but has the force of a declarative, not an interrogative.⁷ For example:

- Don't you think you've had enough ice cream (Almost declarative)
for one night?

The reverse of this is also true; there are sentences with interrogative force that are not questions.⁸ A common example of this is a *request*.⁹ Plus, there are also sentences with interrogative force that are questions but do not ask anything; so care is warranted.¹⁰ Conventional wisdom often refers to the interrogative as a grammatical mood, but this is not the most accurate picture of the interrogative.¹¹ It is a force or intent that goes deeper than the surface structure of a sentence.¹²

An equally difficult contrast we must make is between direct and indirect questions.¹³ On the surface, a *direct question* is one in which the interrogative aspect is in the primary clause, and an *indirect question* is one in which the interrogative aspect occurs in a subordinate clause.¹⁴ In English, as well as most other modern languages, a direct question is punctuated

⁷ Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich, "Why Do You Ask?" *The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 4–5.

⁸ Michael L. Geis, *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 171; and Anthony J. Wootton, "Interactional and Sequential Configurations Informing Request Format Selection in Children's Speech," in *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*, ed. Auli Hakulinen and Margret Selting, SDG 17 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005), 186.

⁹ *Requests* are a special type of speech-act that can be categorized in several different ways, especially when pragmatics and situation are taken into account.

¹⁰ Donald Davidson, *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 110–11.

¹¹ Those who assume an interrogative mood, see for example, Paul Simpson, *Language through Literature: An Introduction*, Interface (London: Routledge, 1997), 140; Andrea Mayr, *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse* (London: Continuum, 2008), 17; John Sinclair, *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*, ed. Ronald Carter (London: Routledge, 2004), 107; Christopher Gauker, *Words without Meaning* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), 3; Ruth Garrett Millikan, *Language: A Biological Model* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 157; and Davidson, *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*, 270; contra Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 51; and Lyons, *Semantics*, 2748. Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber argue interrogativity is best understood as a semantic—not syntactic—mood; see Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber, "Mood and the Analysis of Non-Declarative Sentences," in *Human Agency: Language, Duty, and Value*, ed. Jonathan Dancy, J. M. E. Moravcsik and C. C. W. Taylor (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 78.

¹² Contra Pavel Tichy, "Questions, Answers and Logic," *APQ* 15:4 (1978): 276.

¹³ There are a variety of other terms used near-synonymously with 'indirect question' such as 'embedded interrogative' or 'constituent interrogative'; likewise, direct questions are often called 'root interrogatives.'

¹⁴ David Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 6th ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 400.

as a question and an indirect question is not. A telltale sign for indirect questions is the use of certain types of verbs (such as epistemic verbs) coupled with an interrogative pronoun. For example:

- Where is the football? (Direct question)
- I know where the football is. (Indirect question)

Indirect questions also frequently appear as statements or declaratives rather than questions.¹⁵

- I know you know where the football is. (Indirect question)

Direct and indirect questions can have the same meaning, even while they have different purposes and functions in discourse.¹⁶ To complicate matters, Margarita Suñer argues from a semantic perspective that there are actually semi-questions that exist between direct and indirect questions.¹⁷ As we have come to expect, when differentiating questions in the real world, there are semantic and pragmatic factors that come into play that make this differentiation less problematic than it seems.

These issues present serious problems for delineating the scope of our study. By now we recognize that there are not ‘questions’ and ‘non-questions’ but instead, all sentences exist on a continuum between question and non-question. The implication is that it is possible for us to look at the questions of Jesus in John and miss many of the highly interrogative sentences in the Gospel. At the same time, it is difficult (in a psychological way) to skip over sentences that have question marks in modern translations in favor of sentences that end with other forms of punctuation. Therefore, recognizing the serious problem with interrogativity in a complex text, I will take a practical approach and focus our investigation around sentences that either have strong tendencies toward being a direct question or interrogative.

¹⁵ Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1057.

¹⁶ In fact, in the erotetic theory of David Lewis and others, all questions are reducible to indirect questions; see David Lewis, “General Semantics,” in *Semantics of Natural Language*, edited by Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1972), 169–218; and cf. Lauri Karttunen, “Syntax and Semantics of Questions,” *LP* 1:1 (1977): 3.

¹⁷ Margarita Suñer, “About Indirect Questions and Semi-Questions,” *LP* 16:1 (1993): 52–64. We will not consider semi-questions in this work since many often lack both question form and clear interrogative force.

Questioning Questions

What is a question? Perhaps a good place to start is to ask, “How do we tell a question from a non-question?” While there are many clues that can alert us that a particular sentence may be a question, there actually is no one way to always know when a sentence is a question. Instead, there are a variety of clues and evidences that allow us to make an educated guess about whether a sentence is a question. In Chapter 1, I mentioned one of the most important clues in modern texts, the question mark (punctuation). Punctuation is an important signal when present but it is not a universal answer—modern readers can rely too heavily on punctuation in modern texts, and this is especially true when reading ancient texts. In contrast to Greek grammarians, modern eroteticians believe questions are fully identifiable in discourse even without any punctuation.¹⁸ Other clues can include the syntax of the sentence (such as word order, verbal moods, interrogative particles and interrogative words) or the prosody of the sentence (such as tone or inflection).¹⁹ Since we are reading an ancient text, prosody is not a genuine option.²⁰ But as we will quickly see, neither grammar nor syntax are very accurate indicators of whether a sentence is a question or a non-question.²¹ A final, obvious clue in written discourse is the presence of an ‘answer’ to the question, though we will see this too is deceptive.

We are now in a position to formally distinguish the seven universal ‘tells’ for questions versus non-questions.²² We will exclude punctuation, as a question mark is not a definitive indicator that a sentence is a question.²³ These tells are universal in that when they appear in natural language, they are sure indicators of an interrogative question (when properly utilized). They are:

- Interrogative force (including intonation/stress/rhythm/prosody)
- Interrogative adverbs (such as “why” and “when”)

¹⁸ David Harrah, “A Logic of Questions and Answers,” *Philosophy of Science* 28:1 (1961): 43. An erotetician is a scholar of erotetics, or the study of questions.

¹⁹ Cf. Ludmila Urbanová, “On the Status of Declarative Questions in English Conversation,” *Brno Studies in English* 21 (1995): 59.

²⁰ While it is possible for a modern reader to read (perform) the Greek text of John aloud for prosodic clues, the variables that would come into play are beyond the scope of this work to consider at length. I will make a few notes on prosody in later chapters.

²¹ Robert Fiengo, *Asking Questions: Using Meaningful Structures to Imply Ignorance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 5.

²² Cf. Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 20–21.

²³ Crystal, *How Language Works*, 120.

- Interrogative particles (such as μήτι and ἄρα in Koine Greek)
- Positive-negative conjuncted clauses (in certain languages such as Mandarin, or certain formations such as tag questions)
- Subject-verb inversion (common in SVO languages such as English, German)
- Cleft construction for interrogative use (in certain languages such as French)
- Object-pronoun transformation (in certain languages such as Sanskrit)

Each of these tells is not foolproof; many are prime indicators of interrogativity but may be overridden by other factors (prosody being the main one).²⁴ Only the first three of these tells are relevant to New Testament Greek.

Let us move beyond overt issues and recast our discussion of questions around the way language works on all of its levels. Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees-Miller describe the linguistic enterprise that will help frame our discussion:

Starting from the bottom, [we ground] language first in the physical world of sound (phonetics) and moving up through the organization of sound in language (phonology), to the combination of sounds into words (morphology), and the combination of words into sentences (syntax). Meaning (semantics) usually comes next, on the grounds that it operates on words and sentences. These areas are traditionally said to form the core of linguistics, because they deal with the most formally structured aspects of language. Within the last few decades, however, linguists have come to realize that we cannot understand the most formally structured aspects of language without also understanding the way language is used to convey information (pragmatics) in conversation (discourse) and in literature, and the way language interacts with other aspects of society (sociolinguistics).²⁵

When speaking of questions, the three areas of language that most interest us are *syntax*, *semantics* and *pragmatics*. Since it would be impossible to examine every possible theory for ways to define the word ‘question,’ I find from the relevant literature that there are four major ways we can think about defining questions: *reductionist*, *syntactic*, *semantic* and *pragmatic*.²⁶ Each of these ways of thinking about what makes a question a question is populated with numerous distinct theories, many of which

²⁴ A. M. Devine and Laurence D. Stephens, *The Prosody of Greek Speech* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 452.

²⁵ Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees-Miller, eds., *The Handbook of Linguistics*, BHL (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), xv.

²⁶ There have been a number of attempts to categorize the different theories of questions; most attempts argue for 2–5 categories with 6–15 different theories.

are incompatible with those in the same category—and many of which easily crossover from one way of thinking to another.

Defining Questions

The first way of thinking about how to define questions is *reductionist*. The basic idea behind this is simple; questions are reducible to something else more basic, and so the best way to define them is in this more basic sense. The most prominent theory within this group is the argument that questions are in some way or another reducible to propositions. For example:

- Questions are really disguised assertions (Harold Jeffreys).²⁷
- Questions are special types of statements (David Harrah).²⁸
- Questions are semantically equivalent to declaratives (Lauri Karttunen).²⁹
- Questions are sets of propositions (Martin Bell).³⁰

Another prominent reductionist theory held by many theorists is that questions are reducible to requests for information,³¹ an idea that probably originated in the work of the mathematical logician Gottlob Frege (1848–1925).³² Several of the theories from the other three groups also have reductionist tendencies (such as John Searle’s speech-act approach to questions, below). There are several serious weaknesses among reductionist theories. The most significant is that questions in both their articulation and use display a very different nature than statements.³³ Also important is that examples of questions used in reductionist theories are

²⁷ Harold Jeffreys, *Theory of Probability*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 407.

²⁸ Harrah, “Logic of Questions and Answers,” 46.

²⁹ Karttunen, “Syntax and Semantics,” 3.

³⁰ Bell, “Questioning,” 203.

³¹ Proponents of this view include Jaakko Hintikka, “Questions about Questions,” in *Semantics and Philosophy*, edited by Milton K. Munitz and Peter K. Unger (New York: New York University Press, 1974), 103–104; Lennart Åqvist, *A New Approach to the Logical Theory of Interrogatives: Analysis and Formalization*, TBzL 65 (Tübingen: Narr, 1975); and Frans H. van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragmatic-Dialectical Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 64.

³² Gottlob Frege, “Thought,” in *The Frege Reader*, Blackwell Readers, edited by Michael Beaney (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 329; and cf. Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1062.

³³ Opponents of reductionist theories include Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 13–14; Hookway, “Questions of Context,” 8; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 49, 54; Belnap, “Declaratives,” 4–5; Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1074; Hamblin, “Questions Aren’t Statements,” 62; John E. Llewellyn, “What is a Question?” *AAJP* 42:1 (1964): 70; Ginzburg, “Interrogatives,” 399; Schuhmann and Smith, “Questions,” 353–54; and to a lesser extent, John R. Searle and Daniel Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 175.

often of a limited type or quality, making reducibility appear to be more of an option than it really is.³⁴ Since there are times when questions behave as declaratives or propositions, these theories are useful to understand questions in those situations.

The second way of understanding what questions are is *syntactical*. As syntax relates to the way a speaker or writer builds a complete thought into a sentence, this way of understanding questions relates to their construction as sentence forms. While most theories that define questions have syntactical features, there are few theories of questions that give syntax primacy and therefore fit well within this category. Theories that do focus on syntax include:

- Questions as used in models constructed by grammarians (David Crystal).³⁵
- Questions are sentences with variables replacing constants (Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz).³⁶

Syntactical theories have significant implications for our study in that the questions of Jesus in John are embedded in a narrative structure. However, many of the theories in this category do not address deeper issues of meaning and use that we will want to consider for the questions of the Fourth Gospel. In the practice of reading actual texts, syntax is often overridden by semantic and pragmatic concerns.

The third way of thinking about questions is the *semantic* way. Semantics focuses on the meaning found in language and language structures, and many theories for defining questions are based in semantics as they define questions by what questions mean. A few examples of semantic theories include:

- Questions mean knowing its legitimate answer(s) (Charles Hamblin).³⁷
- Questions simply represent whatever answers it (Gerold Stahl).³⁸

³⁴ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 25.

³⁵ Crystal, *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 400; and cf. Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, deluxe ed. (New York: Longman, 1985), 83. Both Crystal and Quirk, et al., emphasize the semantic value of questions, but they lead with the syntactical aspect.

³⁶ Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, *Logiczne Podstawy Nauczania* (Warszawa, 1934); and cf. Elisabetta Fava, "Questioning Interrogative Interpretation in Some Indo-European Languages," *Language Sciences* 18:1–2 (1996): 95.

³⁷ Charles L. Hamblin, "Questions," *AAJP* 36 (1958): 159–68.

³⁸ Stahl, "Effectivity of Questions," 211. In a similar vein, Leo Apostel argues questions are the set of propositions that comprise them; see Leo Apostel, "Assertion Logic and Theory of Argumentation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 4:2 (1971): 107.

- Questions identify with its one direct answer (Nuel Belnap/Thomas Steel).³⁹
- Questions represent a range of logical possibilities (James Higginbotham).⁴⁰
- Questions are incomplete thoughts, or are missing something (Robert Fiengo).⁴¹
- Questions are differentiated from other sentences by mood (Robert Harnish).⁴²
- Questions represent their relevant answers (Deidre Wilson and Dan Sperber).⁴³

Semantic theories for defining questions are very popular theories as they have a great deal of explanatory power. They also prove to be popular because of their focus on answers, a focus that is important in fields of study such as logic and linguistics but is far less important in our present study.

The fourth and final manner in which we can think about questions is in a *pragmatic* manner. The emphasis of pragmatics is on the hows and whys of speakers and writers who use language to make meanings and create communication. There are many theories for defining questions that rely on pragmatics, including:

- Questions represent a special illocutionary act of requesting something (John Searle).⁴⁴
- Questions are really commands or directives spoken as requests (Daniel Vanderveken).⁴⁵
- Questions are a posing of the speaker's doubts (John Lyons).⁴⁶
- Questions are utterances that seek out information (Rossano/Brown/Levinson).⁴⁷

³⁹ Belnap and Steel, *Logic of Questions and Answers*, 13.

⁴⁰ Higginbotham, "Semantics of Questions," 382.

⁴¹ Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 6; as well as Thomas Knight, "Questions and Universals," *PPR* 27:4 (1967): 564.

⁴² Harnish, "Frege on Mood and Force," 203. Here Harnish refers to mood as more of a semantic—not syntactic—quality.

⁴³ Wilson and Sperber, "Mood," 96.

⁴⁴ John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 66–69; see also Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 78, 131–33, 147, 199–200.

⁴⁵ Daniel Vanderveken, *Meaning and Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 2:11.

⁴⁶ Lyons, *Semantics*, 2:755.

⁴⁷ Frederico Rossano, Penelope Brown, and Stephen C. Levinson, "Gaze, Questioning, and Culture," in *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Jack Sidnell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 205.

- Questions are phenomenologically an event experience between two individuals (Johannes Daubert/Karl Schuhmann).⁴⁸

Much like the semantic group of theories, pragmatic theories are very popular as they often make the most sense when analyzing real-world (as opposed to contrived or simplistic) questions. The major caution with this category is that a question does not need to be asked or performed (in a literal sense) to be a question; too much emphasis can be placed on the asking rather than what is being asked.⁴⁹

Question Elements

As we noted above, there is no ‘theory of everything’ that defines questions. In fact, there is no accepted theory of questions to explain questions well enough to satisfy one field, let alone all fields of study.⁵⁰ There is no way to explain all question functions with one logic or theory.⁵¹ Or even with a dozen theories, as modern logic and linguistics have shown. To be successful, such an ‘interrogative theory of everything’ would have to offer a universal description from the grammatical to the phenomenological—no small task.⁵² The reason is there are a near-infinite number of types of questions; which explains why there are so many different theories.⁵³ To best get at questions, we will be forced to examine the qualities and functions of questions in a practical, eclectic manner borrowing from a variety of different theories including the fields of logic, rhetoric, linguistics, psychology and phenomenology, to name but a few.⁵⁴ While a universal definition of questions is beyond the scope of this book (and perhaps, many books), there is still much we can learn about the qualities of ques-

⁴⁸ Schuhmann and Smith, “Questions,” 380.

⁴⁹ Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 25; Plato, *Theaet.* 189e–190a; Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, 2:328; and contra Ryle, “‘If,’ ‘So’ and ‘Because,’” 245.

⁵⁰ Harrah, “What Should We Teach?” 24.

⁵¹ David Harrah, “Question Generators,” *JPhil* 63:20 (1966): 606; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 68, 235; Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1116; and cf. Hudson, “Meaning of Questions,” 4.

⁵² Schuhmann and Smith, “Questions,” 380.

⁵³ Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.10; Tadeusz Kubinski, *An Outline of the Logical Theory of Questions* (Berlin: Akademie, 1980), 8; and Paolo Leonardi and Marco Santambrogio, “Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers,” in *Possibilities and Limitations of Pragmatics*, ed. Herman Parret, Marina Sbisa, and Jef Verschueren, Studies in Language Companion Series 7 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981), 459.

⁵⁴ Groenendijk and Stokhof argue for the value of this kind of approach; see Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1102.

tions from these various theories. We can observe their qualities as well as the way in which they work and function, and apply this understanding to the questions of Jesus in John. Many of these theories have a great deal of explanatory power, even if they do not always logically and peacefully coexist. We can now turn to the way in which questions function, especially along syntactic, semantic and pragmatic lines.

Questioners construct questions in language, and in order to discover qualities of questions, we will have to examine them as a language act.⁵⁵ As noted above, there are three major elements to a language act such as a question: syntax, semantics and pragmatics.⁵⁶ Generally speaking, a question will have some variation of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic qualities which govern how the question performs in its given context.⁵⁷ These three qualities are often intermixed.⁵⁸ In order to get at the nature of the question, I believe the best approach is to visualize questions in light of these three basic elements.

The Syntax of Questions

The most basic of these three elements is *syntax*. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the relationship between questions and syntax is complicated. On the one hand, we can use syntax to differentiate questions from non-questions in most languages. On the other hand, syntax is typically a very weak indicator of interrogativity.⁵⁹ From a Fregean perspective, we could expect syntax to be the primary, determining factor in explaining the function of questions.⁶⁰ However, this is often not true in practice; many questions in day-to-day conversation are not syntactically identifiable as questions. And when it comes to syntax, every language is different as to what degree syntax indicates interrogativity—there are even a few languages that have no syntactical indication for certain question-types.⁶¹

⁵⁵ John Kekes, "Skepticism and External Questions," *PPR* 31:3 (1971): 330.

⁵⁶ Hudson, "Meaning of Questions," 1; and Hookway, "Questions of Context," 13.

⁵⁷ Cf. Higginbotham, "Semantics of Questions," 362.

⁵⁸ Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1122.

⁵⁹ Cf. Rolf A. Zwaan and Murray Singer, "Text Comprehension," in *Handbook of Discourse Processes*, ed. Arthur C. Graesser, Morton Ann Gernsbacher, and Susan R. Goldman (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003), 108; and Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 6.

⁶⁰ For an example, see D. Robert Ladd, "A First Look at the Semantics and Pragmatics of Negative Questions and Tag Questions," *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society* 17 (1981): 165; and cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.4.2.

⁶¹ For example, see Rossano, Brown, and Levinson, "Gaze, Questioning, and Culture," 205.

The inability of syntax to be conclusive when it comes to interrogativity is especially important as we approach the Fourth Gospel because there are sometimes few syntactical clues in John's Greek to help. In real-world situations, syntax is frequently overridden by semantic and (especially) pragmatic concerns.

Basic grammar recognizes four major types of clauses or sentences: *declarative*, *imperative*, *exclamative*, and *interrogative*.⁶² In an ideal world, these four types of sentences are mutually exclusive in the realm of syntax; thus a sentence cannot be both a declarative and an interrogative from a strictly syntactical perspective.⁶³ Since an ancient text such as the Fourth Gospel does not present an ideal world, determining whether a sentence or clause is declarative or interrogative is not always easy—much depends on whether the internal syntax is strongly indicative of one sentence type or another (such as in the case of *wh*-interrogatives). As we discussed earlier, in many cases syntax alone is not enough. However, once a sentence can be qualified via syntax, it becomes a useful tool for discerning the function of sentences that we already know to be questions. When we observe a sentence we believe to be a question, syntactic-based theories of questions become very useful in breaking down the sentence. While there are numerous taxonomies of questions based on syntax, most logicians argue for somewhere between one and eleven different types of questions.⁶⁴ There are four types of questions that we can deduce directly from syntax via logical principles: *polar questions*, *variable questions*, *set questions*, and *alternative questions*.⁶⁵ For example:

⁶² There are other theories of sentential demarcation that include sentence types such as *affirmative* and *negative* (some ancient grammarians) or *precative* and *dubitative* (some modern grammarians), but these four types are most widespread in Indo-European grammars including ancient Greek. For grammar and grammatical examples I will rely on ancient Greek and English, though I recognize that some of the examples I use would need to be modified in other languages. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this work to make our discussion of questions workable in languages outside ancient Greek and English. Finally, the smallest unit of syntax in which these four types exist is technically the clause, not the sentence, but for the sake of simplicity I will make references from the sentence level.

⁶³ Rodney Huddleston, "Contrast between Interrogatives and Questions," 412.

⁶⁴ Scholars who argue for one are reductionist; for example, see Karttunen, "Syntax and Semantics," 39; and Michael Bennett, "A Response to Karttunen on Questions," *LP* 1:2 (1977): 282. Trying to logically reduce question-types to as few as possible appears to be a favorite pastime of many erotetic logicians.

⁶⁵ We'll look at these four types (and their variations) in later chapters.

- Do you like steak? (Polar question)⁶⁶
- What did Eric want? (Variable question)⁶⁷
- Which road will you take? (Set question)⁶⁸
- Is Violet's birthday in June or July? (Alternative question)⁶⁹

Each of these four types of questions asks different things. While there is no consensus on the number of questions identifiable by syntax, and proposals have argued for between 0 and 9 different question types, there is a great deal of evidence for questions to be syntactically reducible to one of these four types.⁷⁰ Also, they are by far and away the ones most discussed and challenged by logicians and philosophers. Beyond these basic four, there are a number of other types of questions that we can identify syntactically, such as: *conjunctive*, *conditional*, *tag*, and (the various types of) *declarative* questions. Because syntax is both basic and clear-cut, it is a very common method to identify the function of questions.

The Semantics of Questions

The second major characteristic of how questions function is their *semantics*. The semantic qualities of questions are less clear-cut than their syntactic qualities, but are much more promising for actually understanding the function of question use in narrative context. Unlike syntax, semantics play a much greater role in most modern logical or linguistic theories of questions. When dealing with a narrative text such as a gospel, semantics are probably the most indicative in determining the function of the question in the text; however, semantics will only give us clues and not the answers themselves. In the previous chapter on the

⁶⁶ Aristotle believed dialectical (διαλεκτική) questions were always polar, though it is not clear if the reverse is true; see Aristotle, *Top.* 158a14–20; and cf. Aristotle, *Int.* 20b22–25.

⁶⁷ Variable questions are often referred to as ‘wh-’ questions, in light of the grammatical form in which they are usually found in certain Indo-European languages.

⁶⁸ “Set question” is my term for what in English eroteticians refer to as ‘which’ questions, or questions that imply a set of possibilities (and therefore are not completely open).

⁶⁹ Some theorists attempt to reduce alternative questions to polar questions (or vice versa); however, I remain unconvinced these two types are the same; for an example of this reduction, see Karttunen, “Syntax and Semantics,” 4–5; and against reductionism, see Dwight Bolinger, “Yes-no Questions Are Not Alternative Questions,” in *Questions*, ed. Henry Hiz, SLL (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1978), 91–104; and Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 16, 196.

⁷⁰ ‘Which’ questions often represent a fourth, basic category; however, I am less persuaded they are a unique category and instead seem to be more of a pragmatically-disguised, variable question.

context of questions, we read Meno's paradox—the argument that all questions are preconditioned on existing knowledge, never on a total lack of knowledge.⁷¹ The implication of this paradox is that questions betray a part of their use from within.⁷²

While there are many different ways to slice up the semantic value of questions, a simple place to start is differentiating between *open questions* and *confirmation questions*.⁷³ These two questions differ in semantic quality because of what they ask. For example:

- Where would Su-Anne like to live? (Open question)
- Does Jason have a purple parka? (Confirmation question)

With the open question, the meaning of the question—the meaning of what is asked and not the meaning of the answer—is undefined and for all practical purposes, unlimited. In contrast to this, the confirmation question means to discern one idea from another (in this case, whether 'yes' or 'no'). Meaning for questions is related to their interrogative force.

The problem with the semantics of questions is that questions can be quite tricky.⁷⁴ Simple questions, such as the previous examples, frequently have singular meanings but complex questions usually open up a can of semantic worms.⁷⁵ Adding to this is that questions can complexify in many different directions. For example:

- Will Nadine play with Sitka? (Simple question)
- If the news is on, will Nadine play with Sitka? (Complex question)

In the second question, the semantics become much more interesting due to the conditional clause that introduces the sentence. Unfortunately, questions in natural discourse are often more complex than not, as they deal with real-world (nuanced) semantics. Examples of questions where

⁷¹ Plato, *Meno* 86b–c; and contra Aristotle, *Soph. Elench.* 172a23–29.

⁷² This has led many theorists such as Robert Fiengo to argue questions are incomplete or “lack” something, although this would have to mean that the question also has a part of the completed something; see Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 6; Naomi Miyake and Donald A. Norman, “To Ask a Question, One Must Know Enough to Know What is Not Known,” *JVLVB* 18:3 (1979): 357–64; Fales, “Phenomenology of Questions,” 64; cf. Richard E. Snow, “What Do We Know About Question-Asking?” *ESN* 38:7 (1984): 352; and Kleiner, “Erotetic Logic and Scientific Inquiry,” 26.

⁷³ Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 10; and cf. Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1109.

⁷⁴ Carlson, *Dialogue Games*, 24.

⁷⁵ James Higginbotham, “Interrogatives,” in *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (Cambridge: MIT, 1993), 196; though contrast Mary Prior and Arthur Prior, “Erotetic Logic,” *PRev* 64:1 (1955): 55.

semantics play a critical role include *conditional questions* and *biased questions*. Other questions we encounter may depart from real-world semantics and verge onto possible worlds; this occurs when questions become less about seeking information and more about expressing other content such as beliefs or opinions with interrogative force.⁷⁶ Examples in the Fourth Gospel include *test questions* and *deliberative questions*.

The Pragmatics of Questions

The third major way in which a person asks questions is through *pragmatics*. While the majority of modern theories of questions in logic and linguistics rely heavily on semantics, pragmatics are arguably the biggest factor in question determination (in general; less so in a written text).⁷⁷ In many ways, pragmatic qualities are the hardest to discern, and therefore they are the most overlooked in theoretical discussion. While pragmatics alone cannot explain the way questions work,⁷⁸ some pragmatic aspects of utterances such as prosody are very useful. Prosody refers to the intonation and stress a speaker uses to shape a speech act, which in certain situations can be the only way to know definitively whether or not a statement is a question. Many languages have interrogatives that are syntactically and semantically indistinguishable from declaratives, and the only way to differentiate the force of the statement will be through prosodic clues.⁷⁹ Written texts include textual features such as punctuation to alert the reader to prosodic shifts. As a very general principle, most languages associate raised pitch at the end of a sentence with common

⁷⁶ Cf. Fales, "Phenomenology of Questions," 60.

⁷⁷ For example, see Demosthenes (384–322 BC), as cited in Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.6; Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924), 297; Jaakko Hintikka and Ilpo Halonen, "Semantics and Pragmatics for Why-Questions," *JPhil* 92:12 (1995): 636; Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 33; Liddicoat, *Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, 30; Prior and Prior, "Erotetic Logic," 44; Meyer and Cushman, "Argumentation," 83; Hudson, "Meaning of Questions," 24; Urbanová, "Declarative Questions," 59; Keith Stenning, Alex Lascarides, and Jo Calder, *Introduction to Cognition and Communication* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006), 459; and cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 80.

⁷⁸ Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1064.

⁷⁹ Chiara M. Monzoni, "Marked Syntactic Constructions in Italian," in *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*, ed. Auli Hakulinen and Margret Selting, SDG 17 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005), 153; and Roland Meyer and Ina Mleinek, "How Prosody Signals Force and Focus—A Study of Pitch Accents in Russian Yes–No Questions," *JPrag* 38:10 (2006): 1615. Also, prosody is much more powerful an indicator than punctuation; see Liddicoat, *Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, 31.

types of interrogativity.⁸⁰ We know that ancient writers recognized the role of prosody in determining sentence function as Aristotle mentions it briefly in his *Poetics*.⁸¹ As a simple example, consider the following three statements that are identical in syntactic and semantic quality, but very distinct in their function, use and overall meaning:

- Hello.
- Hello!
- Hello?

Because we are reading this as a text, punctuation provides prosodic cues, noticeable if each of these three sentences is read aloud. Let's consider a more complex example, the primary question in John 3:10 ("Jesus answered and said to him, 'Are you the teacher of Israel and you do not know these things?'").⁸² Within the prosodic range of this sentence, there are many options if we give stress to each italicized word:

- Are *you* the teacher of Israel? (Critical of Nicodemus)
- Are you the *teacher* of Israel? (Questions Nicodemus' authority)
- Are you *the* teacher of Israel? (Questions Nicodemus' uniqueness)
- Are you the teacher of *Israel*? (Questions Nicodemus' role)
- Are you the teacher of *Israel*? (Questions Nicodemus' heritage)
- You are the teacher of Israel. (Declaration)

Unfortunately for readers of texts, intonation is rarely shown as it is built into neither the syntactic nor semantic qualities of the question.⁸³ All we have to go on is what we can derive from the syntactic and semantic qualities of the question itself.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Russell Ultan, "Some General Characteristics of Interrogative Systems," in *Universals of Human Language*, ed. Joseph H. Greenberg (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978), 4:211–12; Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*, SIS 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 233; and Devine and Stephens, *Prosody*, 453.

⁸¹ Aristotle, *Poet.* 1456b10 and 1457a21; and see Devine and Stephens, *Prosody*, 454–55.

⁸² As we noted in Chapter 1, there is no way for certain to know that John 3:10 is a question (and John 10:11 is not). There are clues, but nothing definitive.

⁸³ Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, *Prosody in Conversation*, 253.

⁸⁴ It is not uncommon for commentators to pick out an extra article or seemingly-unnecessary pronoun within a question to argue for the point of emphasis (for example, in 3:10 some point to *ὁ*; as an example, Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 132; and others to *σὺ*; as an example, Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 45); however, as I will argue below, there is much more to understanding the force and meaning of a question than any one simple element.

As we prepare to look in detail at the questions of Jesus in John, we are painfully aware that it is impossible to reconstruct the prosody of the original questions.⁸⁵ Without overt prosodic cues or punctuation marks, definitive statements about these questions will be impossible. This, coupled with the move away from the importance of questions in Aristotle, is what makes understanding the questions of Jesus in John a true puzzle. At the same time, there are implicit pragmatic cues within the text that will allow greater understanding of the questions therein. Good examples of this are pragmatic-heavy types of questions such as *echo questions*, *declarative questions* and *opposing-turn questions*. To gain further insight into the questions, we will have to dig deeper into their usage via their linguistic structure.

The Traditional Approach to Questions

The traditional approach to questions presumes one can basically boil questions down to two different categories: informational questions and rhetorical questions.⁸⁶ *Informational questions*, also known as information-seeking questions or ‘real’ questions, are questions asked by the asker so as to gain some bit of information or knowledge from a hearer or listener. Informational questions are the ‘real’ questions of natural discourse—they allow for conversations to be dialogues rather than monologues. In narratives, characters ask informational questions in the sense they desire information from another character within the narrative. In contrast to informational questions, *rhetorical questions* are those that do not seek information as the primary point of the asking (though they may seek information as a secondary objective). As per their name, they are asked in order to create some type of rhetorical effect—therefore they tend to be considered more important in narrative situations. Characters may ask rhetorical questions of other characters, or the narrator or a chorus may ask rhetorical questions designed for the intended reader. The distinction between information questions and rhetorical questions is not always obvious, as it is not based on explicit syntactic qualities.⁸⁷ For example:

⁸⁵ Moulton, “Prosody,” 250–52.

⁸⁶ Quintilian distinguishes between these two basic qualities of questions, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.7; and see Søren Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Irony, with Constant Reference to Socrates*, trans. Lee M. Capel (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 37.

⁸⁷ Recent articles by a few eroteticians try to show how syntax dictates the rhetorical quality of questions; while these arguments are on the right track, I don’t feel a definitive

- How do I get to NASA headquarters? (Informational question)
- Should I turn right or left? (Informational question)
- Who can it be now? (Rhetorical question)
- Does a dog have fleas? (Rhetorical question)

Upon reading these questions, it will be apparent to most readers which ones are asked with the intent to gain information and which are asked with another intent (to express something other than a request for information).⁸⁸ The traditional approach to question categorization cannot explain satisfactorily the reason why this is.⁸⁹

The problem with the traditional approach is its imprecision in explanation and inability to predict the deep structure of questions.⁹⁰ Or to put it more simply, the traditional approach is vague and inaccurate as there are a near-limitless quantity of diverse types of questions, many of which do not fit neatly into a binary (either-or) categorization. In natural discourse, there are many questions seeking information which are highly rhetorical just as there are many question asked with the intent of rhetorical purpose which still garner information for the asker. While both informational questions and rhetorical questions are overly broad categories that fail to explain the way interrogatives function with sufficient

explanation of the relationship between syntax and rhetorical quality exists; plus an extended discussion of this would be beyond the scope of this work; see for example, Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 201–229.

⁸⁸ This exercise will be less obvious to readers whose native language is not English. Literal translations of the informational questions into another language would be understood in much the same way as we understand them in the English, but literal translations of the rhetorical questions into another language may not necessarily be understood in the same way. This is again due to the weakness of 'rhetorical question' as a useful category to understand interrogatives.

⁸⁹ The traditional view also has problems explaining other types of interrogative-like speech acts such as *request questions*: "Can you pass the salt?" is a request, and arguably a question, but it is not rhetorical. Some eroteticians dismiss requests as special non-interrogative utterances, but surely it is a type of interrogative as it in essence is an utterance expecting a response (albeit a non-spoken response, but a response nonetheless). On the whole, requests look like questions, they sound (prosodically, at least in English) like questions, and they act like questions—hence, they are questions. A similar argument could be made for *phatic questions*, such as "How are you?" or "What's up?"

⁹⁰ As Paul de Man's well-known remark makes clear, "What is the use of asking, I ask, when we cannot even authoritatively decide whether a question asks or doesn't ask?" in Paul de Man, *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 10. While I wholeheartedly agree with de Man's frustrations with readers' handling of questions, especially so-called rhetorical questions, the answer to de Man's question—and the point of this book—is that using a variety of tools from areas including logic, rhetoric, and linguistics allows an educated reader to make very precise estimations of the nature of the force of any given sentence in natural discourse.

detail, the problem is more acute with rhetorical questions—in part because of their means of use and in part because they are a staple of narrative discourse.

Rhetorical questions are everywhere as a question-type, but due to their vague nature they are hardly ever defined with any precision or clarity.⁹¹ Part of the problem is the general unfamiliarity with erotetic logic. For example, questions built on polar syntax and questions built on variable syntax possess very different properties when pushed to be strongly rhetorical in natural discourse. Because of the exceedingly broad use of the ‘rhetorical question’ term, a survey of its usage would lead one to believe that a rhetorical question is really any question that is not an informational question. Such a survey would reveal there are two traditional definitions of rhetorical questions: They are a) questions that do not expect answers and b) questions that are not to be understood in a literal manner.⁹² However, because ‘rhetorical’ is not a well-formed type for questions, both of these definitions can be true but neither have to be true. For example:

- Why God, why me? (Rhetorical question)

Using the traditional taxonomy, readers would easily recognize this question as a rhetorical question. Is it? While not a question expecting an answer per se, if the asker received an answer (from a person, from God himself), it would not be unwelcome. In fact, if a speaker asked this question aloud, it is quite possible that someone would be tempted to try

⁹¹ Criticisms of ‘rhetorical questions’ include, Bell, “Questioning,” 209; Groenendijk and Stokhof, “Questions,” 1057; Jane Frank, “You Call That a Rhetorical Question? Forms and Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Conversation,” *JPrag* 14:5 (1990): 723–27; Jeanne Fahnestock, “*Quid pro nobis*: Rhetorical Stylistics for Argument Analysis,” in *Examining Argumentation in Context: Fifteen Studies on Strategic Maneuvering*, ed. Frans H. van Eemeren, Argumentation in Context 1 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009), 198–99; de Man, *Allegories of Reading*, 9–11; Irene Koshik, *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction*, SDG 16 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005), 2; Hudson, “Meaning of Questions,” 16; Brian J. Reese, “Bias in Questions” (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2007), 190; Cornelia Ilie, *What Else Can I Tell You? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts*, Stockholm Studies in English 82 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 42; J. Kenneth Kuntz, “The Form, Location, and Function of Rhetorical Questions in Deutero-Isaiah,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, VTSup 70.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1122; and Russell Lee-Goldman, “A Typology of Rhetorical Questions” (paper presented at the Syntax and Semantics Circle, University of California-Berkeley, February 17, 2006), 9.

⁹² Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 62.

to answer it. This is because many rhetorical questions can expect and receive answers in a way similar to informational questions.⁹³ At the same time, this question is not literal, in the sense that the asker is not seeking ontological information about themselves, but it is not totally figurative, either. It does not assert a proposition opposite to the question, as some define the figurative nature of rhetorical questions. Although this is just one example, the conclusion we draw from it is that the traditional, binary view of questions—as either informational or rhetorical—is an overly simplistic paradigm with very limited explanatory power.⁹⁴

Stepping back from the problem, there are several advantages to reworking the traditional viewpoint rather than trying to eliminate it completely (a task beyond the scope of this book). The key to this is to examine and qualify the informational and rhetorical qualities of individual questions.⁹⁵ While it is inaccurate to declare “Why God, why me?” a purely rhetorical question (or a purely informational question), we can instead describe it in this situation as a question with a strong rhetorical quality and a mild informational quality. Thus, it is helpful for us to speak of the rhetorical qualities of questions, even if we choose not to oversimplify with a binary categorization. As we look at the questions of Jesus in John, we will notice that some questions have stronger rhetorical qualities and some have milder rhetorical qualities, just as some have stronger information-seeking qualities, and some have milder information-seeking qualities. There is no combination that is not possible in the right context.

Informational Qualities of Questions

We can use the traditional approach to questions to help identify the way questions work in narrative through their informational and rhetorical qualities. Understanding these qualities is useful, but we must bear in mind the context or pragmatics of a question can always override the

⁹³ Koshik, *Beyond Rhetorical Questions*, 2; Lee-Goldman, “A Typology of Rhetorical Questions,” 9; and contra Tanya Stivers and N. J. Enfield, “A Coding Scheme for Question-Response Sequences in Conversation,” *JPrag* 42:10 (2010): 2623.

⁹⁴ Some eroteticians retain the informational-rhetorical system, coming up with (usually partial) taxonomies of the different sub-types of rhetorical questions. While I’m not sure this solves the underlying problem, it is a much better solution than usually offered.

⁹⁵ Of course, part of the problem with the traditional approach is there are other qualities—not just informational and rhetorical—by which we can evaluate questions. For example, we could consider the *revelational* quality of questions—meaning to what degree a question reveals information about the asker.

expected qualities of the question or even its type.⁹⁶ The informational qualities of questions correlate with the asker's desire for a response. While questions with a strong informational quality request or demand a traditional spoken answer, questions with a mild informational quality are more free to seek or accept answers in other ways—general replies, signs of agreement, actions instead of words, or other less common inputs. If a question sparks, encourages or continues conversation, then it generally has some degree of informational quality. Informational qualities are much more useful in engaging listeners in true dialogue than rhetorical qualities. When it comes to narrative, informational qualities in questions not only help move the story along and fill readers in with more information, but also give greater insight into characters and make the narrative feel alive and well.⁹⁷ The skillful use of informational questions by the narrator endows the narrative with a very robust, verisimilar property, reflecting 'real life' conversations.

Almost all utterances with any type of interrogative force or question quality are at their base informational, if useful information is desired by the speaker and available from the audience.⁹⁸ Questions with noticeable informational qualities generally fall into three main categories: open, reflective and decisive.⁹⁹ Questions that fall into these categories either overtly solicit information from others, encourage listeners to think and respond, or ask hearers to make a decision and then let the asker know. Within each of these categories are numerous different types of questions that, in varying degrees, are most often used by a speaker to gain some type of information from the audience. In the Gospel of John, almost sixty percent of the questions of Jesus possess conspicuous informational qualities.

⁹⁶ For example, very polite and/or timid negative polar questions; cf. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, 80.

⁹⁷ Kathryn Vitalis Hoffman and Mark Vitalis Hoffman, "Question Marks and Turning Points: Following the Gospel of Mark to Surprising Places," *Word & World* 26:1 (2006): 69.

⁹⁸ Eun-Ju Noh, *Metarepresentation: A Relevance-Theory Approach*, P&BNS 69 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000), 99.

⁹⁹ Throughout the remainder of this book, I will speak of *categories* and *types* of questions. By *category* I mean a loose, generalized group of question types built around similarities in their usage. By *type* I mean question kinds identifiable and differentiable by either syntactic, semantic, and/or pragmatic cues.

Rhetorical Qualities of Questions

Questions with a rhetorical quality correlate with the asker's desire to impart something (an assertion, a possibility, a persuasion, or other) to a listener. The rhetorical quality of questions has nothing to do with whether or not they are answered.¹⁰⁰ The rhetorical quality may be as simple as a mild, implicit encouragement to consider the asker's point of view, or it may be as complex as a strong threat to obey the asker's wishes. With a strong rhetorical quality, questions become almost assertions, usually (but not always) proposing the reverse of the literal meaning of the question.¹⁰¹ 'Almost' is the key word, as even questions with a strong rhetorical quality can still seek information. Within narrative, questions with a rhetorical quality make the text come alive, adding dynamics and a sense of tension that on a base level persuades the reader to remain interested.¹⁰² Questions with a noticeable rhetorical quality project this tension because of the tension that exists within the logic of the question itself. These types of questions are in a state of tension between the literal reading and the figurative reading, which give these questions their 'rhetorical' feel.¹⁰³ This tension also allows questions with a strong rhetorical quality to invoke ambiguity or irony in the reading.¹⁰⁴ Unlike questions

¹⁰⁰ Conversation analysts show that most questions in natural discourse are never actually answered; see for example, Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 23.

¹⁰¹ Some eroteticians argue this declarative-interrogative switch is at the root of the rhetorical quality; see for example, Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 202, 222; Groenendijk and Stokhof, "Questions," 1057; Carlson, *Dialogue Games*, 126; Ilie, *What Else Can I Tell You?* 128; but contra Lee-Goldman, "A Typology of Rhetorical Questions," 9.

¹⁰² Longinus, *Subl.* 18; Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 29; Craig, *Asking For Rhetoric*, 4; A. López Eire, "Rhetoric and Language," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington, BCAW (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 347; Marta Mignini, "The Rhetorical Component of Dialogic Communication in Banks' Annual Reports," in *Dialogue and Rhetoric*, ed. Edda Weigand, *Dialogue Studies* 2 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008), 214; Fahnestock and Secor, *Rhetoric of Argument*, 343; and Kevin L. Blankenship and Traci Y. Craig, "Rhetorical Question Use and Resistance to Persuasion: An Attitude Strength Analysis," *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 25:2 (2006): 120.

¹⁰³ Paul de Man sees this tension as the root cause of the rhetorical quality of questions. Against this view are examples of questions that fit the traditional description of rhetorical question but tack clearly to the literal or figurative side (for example, "Can't we get started?" would seem to be figurative, but not in every context). The problem with de Man's argument is not the argument itself but the poor definition of what 'rhetorical' really means in English; see de Man, *Allegories of Reading*, 9–11; and cf. Brian Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), 458.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 22–23.

with information-seeking qualities, questions with rhetorical qualities may be liminal interrogatives, existing on the threshold between question and assertion. These types of questions use this to their advantage to push and persuade the reader into agreement (or disagreement) with the asker (whether narrator, or a character in the text). Questions with a rhetorical quality may also be used to short-circuit future lines of argumentation.¹⁰⁵ The mere presence of questions with strong rhetorical qualities make an audience more argumentative, for better or worse.¹⁰⁶ They were a very common literary and oratorical figure in the ancient world.¹⁰⁷

Questions with a strong rhetorical quality are usually not difficult to identify if one is aware of certain conditions that make questions more rhetorical.¹⁰⁸ Some of the more common tells include: negative polarity, inclusion of bias words, inclusion of non-essential words, turn-two occurrences, tags, and of course, context and pragmatic factors. Since questions with a rhetorical quality look to give as much or more than as to receive, a rhetorical quality is, as a whole, much more useful for persuading listeners than an informational quality. When used together, questions with a strong informational quality, questions with a strong rhetorical quality, and questions with both mild qualities make for stimulating and engaging

¹⁰⁵ Paul Butler, *Out of Style: Reanimating Stylistic Study in Composition and Rhetoric* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 2008), 29.

¹⁰⁶ Blankenship and Craig, "Rhetorical Question Use and Resistance to Persuasion," 120; Manfred Kraus, "From Figure to Argument: *Contrarium* in Roman Rhetoric," in *Pondering on Problems of Argumentation: Twenty Essays on Theoretical Issues*, ed. Frans H. van Eemeren and Bart Garssen, AL 14 (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), 127; and cf. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome*, 72; Richard E. Petty, John T. Cacioppo, and Martin Heesacker, "Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion: A Cognitive Response Analysis," *JPSP* 40:3 (1981): 432; Fahnestock and Secor, *A Rhetoric of Argument*, 344.

¹⁰⁷ John Barsby, "Native Roman Rhetoric: Plautus and Terence," in *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, ed. William Dominik and Jon Hall, BCAW (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 52.

¹⁰⁸ Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 203. This statement is based on a logical understanding of rhetorical qualities in question, not on the traditional understanding of rhetorical questions. As the Fourth Gospel is a historiographical text—in whatever degree—the traditional understanding of rhetorical questions cannot predict which question is actually a rhetorical question. Therefore, whenever a commentator of a historiographical text (such as the Fourth Gospel) states a question is a 'rhetorical question,' it is always an assumption (perhaps a very good assumption). The only precise reading of the questions within a historiographical narrative is to identify qualities based on the logic and linguistics of the sentences within their context. For a parallel example, see Eugene B. Borowitz, *The Talmud's Theological Language-Game: A Philosophical Discourse Analysis*, SUNY Series in Jewish Philosophy (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006), 42, 78.

narrative prose.¹⁰⁹ In the Fourth Gospel, more than sixty percent of the questions of Jesus have noticeable rhetorical qualities.¹¹⁰ This means the majority of Jesus' questions were asked in order to persuade listeners.

¹⁰⁹ Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 203.

¹¹⁰ This does *not* mean that more than sixty percent of Jesus's questions should be considered rhetorical questions. This also does *not* mean that less than forty percent of Jesus' questions are informational—it means that less than forty percent have little or no rhetorical value. In fact, almost sixty percent of Jesus' questions possess noticeable informational qualities.

CHAPTER FOUR

JOHN'S USE OF QUESTIONS

It is better to know some of the questions than all of the answers.

—James Thurber

The Gospel of John states it is a historiographical narrative—an eyewitness testimony about the life of a man named Jesus (John 21:24–25). Any reader who reads the gospel will expect the discourse to be ‘natural’ discourse; neither artificial nor contrived. However, the trick with the naturalness of discourse within all narratives, regardless of genre or fictional/historical quality, is representation. Since all narratives narrate only the tiniest part of the whole story, their meaningfulness to readers depends a great deal on how well they represent the entire story in a clear and succinct manner.¹ Often this is what separates a great narrative (and a great narrator) from a poor narrative (and a poor narrator). How well the narrative works depends a great deal on the representation of the greater story into the narrow narrative frame. John himself tells us he had to trim the fat on the Jesus story (21:25); he only included what he believed to be most important to convince others to believe in Jesus (20:31). As a result, it is quite normal for a reader to wonder why John incorporates certain statements and omits (potentially many, many) others. What I want to ask is different: Why did John include the questions of Jesus that he did, and why include those questions instead of other questions (or just more statements)? What do those questions mean and what are their purposes for being asked? If the statements of Jesus in John are significant (not all, of course, but maybe most of them), would it not stand to reason that the questions of Jesus in John are significant (not all, of course, but maybe most of them)? If we skim the questions of Jesus in John, we note they do appear to be slightly different in style and function than the questions of Jesus recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. It makes us wonder why John selects the questions of Jesus that he did.

¹ If representation is poor, readers will feel the book ‘rambles’ or is confusing (plot), characters are vague or inconsistent (characterization), or a whole host of other problems.

Why John Uses Questions

Questions, unlike propositions, add dynamics to narrative. A narrative comprised only of propositions might seem to readers to be trite, flat and a bit boring. It appears likely Jesus (as John's protagonist) would have to ask at least a few questions with a minimum degree of logical and rhetorical variety for the Fourth Gospel to be read as a meaningful narrative. At the same time, John is no James Joyce, who wrote parts of *Ulysses* peppered with interrogatives as a modern plot device.² And Jesus is probably no Socrates, though many readers note the large degree to which both enjoyed asking questions.³ Even as John and the Synoptic Gospels both depict Jesus as a question-asker, some of the church fathers struggled to understand the purpose behind Jesus' question asking. For example, Augustine (AD 354–430) seems defensive when commenting on the idea that Jesus asked questions; presumably the idea of Jesus learning or inquiring went against Augustine's ideas of Jesus' divinity (and was a point of attack used by non-Christians in his day).⁴ This was an even bigger issue for Cyril of Alexandria (AD c. 375–444), who was very concerned about the implications of Jesus' potential ignorance.⁵ Still, one wonders whether some of this was a point of linguistic misunderstanding, not theological, as Cyril sometimes seemed to believe questions were only asked in order to gain information. Perhaps these fathers read too much Aristotle and not enough Plato.

The traditional view of questions is that a speaker asks them for two, simple reasons: to gain information and to make a rhetorical statement. Kathryn and Mark Hoffman explain this perspective of questions well:

² Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 80; and cf. Stephen Sicari, *Joyce's Modernist Allegory: Ulysses and the History of the Novel* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001): 175–77.

³ For example, Joseph Priestly, *Socrates and Jesus Compared* (Philadelphia: P. Byrne, 1803), 34–36; Thomas Deman, *Socrate et Jésus* (Paris: L'Artisan du Livre, 1944), 126; Robert H. Stein, *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings*, rev. ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 23–25; John F. O'Grady, *Models of Jesus Revisited* (Mahwah: Paulist, 1994), 10; Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 53; and Michael J. McClymond, *Familiar Stranger: An Introduction to Jesus of Nazareth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 103.

⁴ For example, Augustine, *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 103.2; and cf. John Chrysostom, *Hom. Jo.* 18, 83.

⁵ For example, Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint John*, trans. Thomas Randell (London: Walter Smith, 1885), 2:122–23, 237. Maurice Wiles rightly strikes Cyril's concern as overblown, a tempest in a teacup; see Maurice F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 142–43.

Narratively, [questions] function naturally in advancing the dialogue and in shaping characterizations. Rhetorically, however, they function to engage us, the readers or hearers, to cause us to evaluate our responses in light of the disciples in the Gospel, and to help us reflect on Jesus and his ministry as the good news.⁶

However, in real life, people ask questions for a multitude of reasons. They ask questions to seek information, to confirm a suspicion, to test others, to ponder an idea, to rebut an argument, to persuade an audience, to make a request, to cause someone to think, to insult an antagonist, to interrogate the guilty, to shame another, to try out a point of view, to direct another's thoughts, to register surprise, to engage in debate, to introduce the ironic, to make a joke, or to order someone else around. Therefore, we should not be surprised to learn that Jesus also asks questions for many different reasons.⁷ In all, there are more than fifty questions Jesus asks in the Fourth Gospel; with the exception of the Farewell Discourse, the questions of Jesus are spread evenly throughout the narrative.⁸ If we lay aside theology for a moment, and simply approach John as a reader of narrative, we will see that Jesus asks questions to gain information, to challenge others, to test assumptions, to criticize an opponent, to let a thought drift, to strike up a debate, and many more besides. If we look at questions through their logical and linguistic uses, we will find they can actually be used for many different purposes, purposes that blur rigid definitions. If we can understand some of the predominant ways the Johannine Jesus uses questions, we can gain a greater understanding of Jesus' discourse as well as gain insight into the purpose of John's gospel.

Questions Inform Dialogue

The first broad purpose of questions of Jesus in the Gospel of John is to inform the dialogue Jesus has with other Johannine characters.⁹ The stock answer to the question of questions in narrative is that questions help to

⁶ Hoffman and Hoffman, "Question Marks and Turning Points," 69.

⁷ Stein, *Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings*, 23.

⁸ While it is common to see books citing the exact number of questions Jesus asks in each gospel, this is inaccurate as there is no way to definitively say the number of questions Jesus asked in a gospel. The number is and must be an approximation.

⁹ Dialogue, arguably more so than the Synoptics, is a key ingredient of the Johannine narrative; see W. R. Dörmes, "The Johannine Drama," *JTSA* 42 (1983): 31.

move the plot forward by adding an ebb and flow to discourse.¹⁰ This is true, but there is more to questions than this. For example, imagine trying to develop characters in a narrative without the ability to ask questions: The narrator would be forced to direct everything via declaratives; there would be little opportunity for the characters to learn from each other or to explore their relationships. Questions help characters express emotion—a characteristic truly hard to convey from the 2D black and white of text.¹¹ Questions also tell on the asker, since every question embeds some degree of presuppositional information.¹² We learn about the audience from their answers, but we learn about the speakers from their questions. Questions must be well-formed, or they can cast the speaker in a less-flattering light by revealing ignorance.¹³

Many things a character may learn obliquely through questions would have to be explained directly through declaratives. Questions serve as an “essential part in the development of the dialogue.”¹⁴ More often than not, dialogue in narrative is defined by its argumentation and questioning.¹⁵ A character’s decisions and rationale are much more understandable and convincing when the character arrives at an answer from questioning rather than simply stating a proposition.¹⁶ This goes hand-in-glove with the Johannine Jesus who is bent on teaching others to hear and believe (John 5:24).¹⁷ In response to him, several of the characters and character groups in the Fourth Gospel behave with chorus-like effect, using questions to ask Jesus to clarify or explain himself further (for example the crowds, in 7:20, 12:34).¹⁸ Questions also allow the characters to inform on each other, in the sense that a character’s questions reveal a great deal

¹⁰ Joe Park Poe, “Word and Deed: On ‘Stage-Directions’ in Greek Tragedy,” *Mnemosyne* 56:4 (2003): 428; Janet L. Johnson, “Questions and Role Responsibility in Four Professional Meetings,” *Anthropological Linguistics* 22:2 (1980): 72; and Brant, *Dialogue and Drama*, 194.

¹¹ Brant, *Dialogue and Drama*, 53; and Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 84.

¹² Lyons, *Semantics*, 2:503; Fales, “Phenomenology of Questions,” 64; and Walton, *New Dialectic*, 141.

¹³ Snow, “What Do We Know About Question-Asking?” 355. Hence Cyril’s concerns.

¹⁴ James McCaffrey, *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14, 2–3*, *AnBib* 114 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987), 151.

¹⁵ Kent F. Moors, “Plato’s Use of Dialogue,” *CW* 72:2 (1978): 77.

¹⁶ Stein, *Method and Message of Jesus’ Teachings*, 23.

¹⁷ Augustine, *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 103.2.

¹⁸ Brant, *Dialogue and Drama*, 181; cf. Domeris, “Johannine Drama,” 34; and Ram, “Theory of Questions and Question Asking,” 289.

about the character's purpose, intent and perspective.¹⁹ Since many questions in narrative are left unanswered, this too can reveal a great deal about the characters that inhabit the narrative world.²⁰

Questions Persuade Readers

The second, broad purpose of the questions of Jesus in John is to persuade readers. John's Gospel is very clearly written for a purpose: To persuade readers to believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing the reader may have life in his name (20:31). When writing his narrative, John not only selected what parts of the story to include and exclude, he also shaped the story by his choices. John shaped his story for a purpose, and at its most elementary definition, this is the distinction of rhetoric.²¹ The Fourth Gospel is a work of rhetoric, as its purpose is to influence and convince (20:30–31).²² That John's work is rhetorical has no bearing on whether or not John based his story on testimony as an attempt at historiography or biography.²³ While John may not display many examples of a Greek schoolboy's rhetoric from extant manuals, his ability to shape a narrative with a coherent argument and great impact for Greek readers

¹⁹ Henderson, "On Questions," 306; and cf. Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 140.

²⁰ Cf. Donald J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*, University of California Publications Classical Studies 21 (Berkeley: University of California, 1979), 6.

²¹ Cf. George A. Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 4.

²² Black, "The Words That You Gave to Me," 221; George L. Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*, WUNT 258 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 2; Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 97; cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1355b; Amos N. Wilder, *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 57; and Edward Schiappa and Jim Hamm, "Rhetorical Questions," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington, BCAW (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 4.

²³ If so, rhetoric was an important feature of Greek historiography; see Th. Wiedemann, "Rhetoric in Polybius," in *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, ed. Herman Verdin, Guido Schepens, and E. de Keyser, *Studia Hellenistica* 30 (Leuven: Orientaliste, 1990), 300; and Paul N. Anderson, "From One Dialogue to Another: Johannine Polyvalence from Origins to Receptions," in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, SBLRBS 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 114–15.

is proof positive of its ancient, rhetorical value.²⁴ As Quintilian notes, if Demades, a lowly fisherman, could in later life attain simply by practice the high virtue of great rhetoric, it would be quite easy for an early follower of Jesus to use more plain forms of rhetoric in his composition of the Gospel.²⁵ Arguably, rhetoric undergirds much of the New Testament, as it was a foundational plank for learning to communicate in Greek—even in cases of second language acquisition.²⁶ Even more so, Christian narratives such as the Gospel of John were never intended as information sources or historical databases, but to effectively and passionately persuade people to believe in Jesus as Messiah.²⁷ John's questions are part and parcel of this rhetorical enterprise—to ask readers about the divine so as to persuade readers of the divine.²⁸

To this end, Jesus' questions in John are raised in order to influence its readers. Generally speaking, questions are significantly more persuasive than propositions.²⁹ When a hearer or reader allows a question to be raised, the reader acquiesces power to the asker.³⁰ This power exchange occurs in several ways. The most obvious is through engagement. All things being equal, a reader engages a proposition by 'hearing' it but a reader engages a question by 'answering' it. Since answering is more involved than hearing—it requires a greater commitment from the reader—

²⁴ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1354a; contra (for the most part) Dennis L. Stamps, "The Johannine Writings," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 614, 619. George Kennedy cites just the example Stamps argues doesn't exist, see Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 113. The Gospel, a complex narrative, defies the logic of simplistic examples; Wilhelm H. Wuellner, "Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith," *Semeia* 53 (1991): 120–121; and cf. Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 137.

²⁵ Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.17.12. Quintilian reports even in his day the many different styles and types of rhetoric practiced; rhetoric could be as high as a form of virtue or as low as those without skill who used it in everyday situations; see Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.20.2–4.

²⁶ Witherington, *New Testament Rhetoric*, 5.

²⁷ William S. Vorster, "Op weg na 'n post-kritiese Nuwe-Testamentiese wetenskap," *HTS* 43 (1987): 385; Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1997), 22; and A. Q. Morton and J. McLeman, *The Genesis of John* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew, 1980), 169.

²⁸ Edelman, "Ancient Traditions, Modern Needs," 115.

²⁹ Dolf Zillman, "Rhetorical Elicitation of Agreement in Persuasion," *JPSP* 21:2 (1972): 163; and for example, Butler, *Out of Style*, 111.

³⁰ Elias Canetti, *Crowds and Power*, trans. Carol Stewart (New York: Continuum, 1981), 285; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 130, 238; James Crosswhite, *The Rhetoric of Reason: Writing and the Attractions of Argument* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 88; Wang, "Questions," 532; and Gruber, "Questions and Strategic Orientation," 1854.

questions are one of the most important devices in narratives for getting the reader involved.³¹ Thus, power shifts from the reader (who chooses to read) to the narrator (whose questions demand answers). Questions are among the forefront of literary devices that subvert the reading process so as to influence and persuade readers.³² An example of the interrogative's power of persuasion is its non-neutrality; while propositions may at times contain implicit assumptions, questions *always* contain implicit assumptions that are traceable back to the philosophical perspective of the asker.³³ These implicit assumptions are quite effective at influencing readers.³⁴ It is this subversion and power exchange that leads to the question's unique power to tap into the emotions of readers.³⁵

Given John's proclivity for Jesus' questions to occur at hinge points within the Fourth Gospel, there can be little doubt John composed his narrative with the realization—questions engage and persuade readers.³⁶ Not only was John willing to show the squabbling between gospel characters so as to inform their dialogue and growth, John was also willing to use questions to squabble with the reader over the identity of and belief in Jesus. To paraphrase James Crosswhite, "Propositions don't pick fights."³⁷ But questions certainly do; something the Johannine Jesus takes full advantage of with his opponents and something John takes full advantage of with his readers. The questions of Jesus in John take advantage of readers' "natural impulse" to answer questions (especially with John's

³¹ Barber, *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo*, 81; Hoffman and Hoffman, "Question Marks and Turning Points," 69; Fahnestock and Secor, *Rhetoric of Argument*, 342; and Henry Wansbrough, "The Finale of the Davidic Succession Narrative?" in *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart*, ed. Carmel McCarthy and John F. Healey, JSOTSup 375 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 51.

³² Sandra M. Schneiders, *Written That You May Believe: Encountering Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1999), 32. Equally interesting is in Paul Duke's seminal book on irony in the Fourth Gospel, Duke notes that almost all of the centers of irony in John are found in the questions; see Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 52.

³³ To put it another way, all questions are minimally leading whereas (it seems to me) all propositions are not (or at least not to the same degree); see James S. Baxter, Julian C. W. Boon, and Charles Marley, "Interrogative Pressure and Responses to Minimally Leading Questions," *Personality and Individual Differences* 40 (2006): 90.

³⁴ Douglas Walton, *One-Sided Arguments: A Dialectical Analysis of Bias*, SUNY Series in Logic and Language (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999), 231.

³⁵ Barber, *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo*, 41; and Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 84.

³⁶ For example, openings such as John 1:38 (first disciples), 2:4 (mother), 5:6 (disabled man), 6:5 (Philip), 8:10 (alleged adulterer), 9:35 (blind man), 18:34 (Pilate), 20:15 (Mary Magdalene), and 21:5 (last disciples); and climaxes such as 3:10 (Jesus' wake-up call to Nicodemus), 7:19 (Jesus' challenge of the crowd's intent), 11:26 (Jesus' call for decision from Martha), 18:11 (Jesus' arrest), and 21:17 (Jesus' call for decision from Peter).

³⁷ Crosswhite, *The Rhetoric of Reason*, 87–88.

question choices).³⁸ Plus, the problem with a question is that it usually provokes other questions. The result is a gospel that, at times, leaves much unanswered.³⁹ This is what leads to the unique ability of the Fourth Gospel: Persuading readers to consider the most improbable of ideas—Jesus was and is the Son of God (1:34).

Obstacles to John's Questions

Before we tackle the questions of Jesus in John, there are a few obstacles to consider. First, questions are an uncharted area of research for most ancient narratives including John. Not counting the couple of pages (on average) devoted to the basic syntax of interrogatives in every New Testament Greek grammar book, very little exists in the way of serious study of what is surely a major device within most books of the New Testament, the Septuagint, and other Greek texts of mid- to late antiquity. Therefore, developing an exhaustive grammar of Greek questions is well beyond the scope of this book. At first glance, even simple-looking questions in John (for example, 16:31) may seem easy to handle but they are actually quite logically and linguistically complex.⁴⁰ One of the many problems that can arise is that questions in natural discourse are often truncated, meaning they can omit words that are necessary for understanding the logic of the question.⁴¹ Our understanding of Greek pragmatics and prosody is minimal.⁴² A further complication is that there are simply a great deal of unknowns with Greek questions. Different languages signal interrogative force differently.⁴³ In most modern Western languages, standardization in areas such as word order and punctuation provide parameters with which a reader can estimate the particular force of a sentence. These same basic grammatical expectations do not exist in John's Greek.⁴⁴ As a

³⁸ Fahnestock and Secor, *Rhetoric of Argument*, 342.

³⁹ Brant, *Dialogue and Drama*, 258; and McCaffrey, *House with Many Rooms*, 150.

⁴⁰ Carlson, *Dialogue Games*, 24.

⁴¹ See for example, Tichy, "Questions, Answers and Logic," 282.

⁴² Egbert J. Bakker, *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, BCAW (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 102.

⁴³ Mark Tatham and Katherine Morton, *Expression in Speech: Analysis and Synthesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 260.

⁴⁴ For example, the fluidity of word order in Greek prevents a reader from knowing for certain whether some sentences are declaratives or polar questions; on word order, see McKay, *New Syntax*, 94; Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed., trans. Henry Thackeray (London: MacMillan, 1905), 259; Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New*

result, deciding whether or not a sentence is a question in John is seemingly based on semantics and context (for narrative, pragmatics).⁴⁵ While semantics are a useful ingredient, if a word is misconstrued, it can throw off the whole force of the sentence.⁴⁶ Plus, a common trait in narrative is for speakers to ask questions that do not receive an answer (which does not have any bearing on whether they are 'rhetorical').⁴⁷ In John, there is no way to indicate pause, silence, reflection, or other factors surrounding the force of an utterance that may be a question.⁴⁸ Not to mention that in ancient Greek, narrators rarely introduced direct questions with (what modern readers would view as) the appropriate verbs.⁴⁹ In light of this, it is not unusual to see commentators go against the norm and argue for or against a sentence being a question in John.⁵⁰

Second, questions may be the most overlooked narrative device in the Fourth Gospel among modern commentators. For the reasons above—and

Testament, 1175; Charles H. Kahn, *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek: With a New Introductory Essay* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003), 426.

⁴⁵ Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 194.

⁴⁶ George P. Baker and Henry B. Huntington, *The Principles of Argumentation*, rev. ed. (Boston: Ginn, 1905), 20.

⁴⁷ Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, 6.

⁴⁸ Cf. Bradford Vivian, *Being Made Strange: Rhetoric Beyond Representation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004), 170; and Butler, *Out of Style*, 29.

⁴⁹ In modern languages such as English, a narrator typically introduces a direct question with an appropriate interrogative verb such as 'ask' or 'inquire' when context allows. This is important because if a reader reads, "Lillie said, 'Who is going to drive the car?'" then the reader reads it primarily as a declarative (meaning that Lillie is stating something about the driver the car, to say nothing of influencing a rhetorical reading); on this see Masa-aki Yamanashi, "Speech-Act Constructions, Illocutionary Forces, and Conventionality," in *Essays in Speech Act Theory*, ed. Daniel Vanderveken and Susumu Kubo, P&BNS 77 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), 229–30. However, in ancient Greek, it was quite acceptable for the narrator to introduce direct questions into dialogue using non-interrogative verbs; this seems to hold true to some degree in both Attic and Koine Greek. In fact, in the Fourth Gospel, with only one of the questions of Jesus does John introduce with an interrogative verb: ἐπερωτάω in John 18:7. I can detect no reason for this verse to be represented differently. But this monochromatic verbal coloration has the effect of making the normally-dynamic interrogatives feel more flat in John than they otherwise were intended to be.

⁵⁰ For example, Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: Sermons on the Gospel of St. John*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Daniel E. Poellot, trans. Martin H. Bertram, *Luther's Works* 23 (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1961), 160–65; Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1997), 230; Udo Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 141; Fernando F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 83; Schneiders, *Written That You May Believe*, 198; and cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Lect.* 13.

more—the questions of Jesus in John are simply not dealt with as questions. So common is it to read a modern critic treat Jesus' questions as propositions that any uninformed reader would wonder whether Jesus asked any questions at all in John, or only made theological declarations.⁵¹ The tyranny of the proposition presents a significant problem for the future of Johannine studies. Nitpicky as it may seem, even the way we speak about Jesus' questions is inaccurate—and it betrays our presuppositions as professional readers. If we do treat Jesus' questions inaccurately with declarative force so as to get at the 'theology' or the 'source,' and not with the appropriate interrogative force, then the actual meaning of the utterance is lost to us.⁵² And if modern interpretations of John cannot properly account for the questions Jesus asked, then these interpretations are fatally flawed.⁵³ Unfortunately, this practice is common not just in Johannine studies, but in many other fields touching on the interpretation of narrative texts.⁵⁴

Third, correcting these systemic problems in New Testament studies is truly beyond the scope of this book. Instead, in the remaining chapters I offer glimpses and examples of how we can better come to terms with the questions of Jesus in John. Questions, as I noted earlier, are quite devious; their logic, presuppositions and argument structure are usually buried well below the surface.⁵⁵ It is in their deep logic that their meaning can best be understood. Rather than looking at the questions through a simple grammatical or semantic lens, I have borrowed techniques from the logic and linguistics of erotetics to create a theory to bring out the hidden logic of some of the questions of Jesus in John. I believe approaching questions with some rigor can be a partial antidote to the propositional hegemony.⁵⁶ In doing this, I make no attempt to be exhaustive: I neither cover every

⁵¹ This practice is so prevalent I chose not to footnote it throughout my book. It would not be possible for me to cite every critic who does this for each question, and just citing a few each time I feel would be unhelpful since the problem is entrenched across the board in Johannine studies. My hope is to spur future commentators toward reading the questions of Jesus as questions.

⁵² Gérard Genette, *Fiction and Diction*, trans. Catherine Porter (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 50.

⁵³ Ernest Lepore and Kirk Ludwig, *Donald Davidson's Truth-Theoretic Semantics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 264.

⁵⁴ Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, 16.

⁵⁵ Walton, *New Dialectic*, 137.

⁵⁶ And prevents future readers from remarking, questions are "just questions"; cf. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, 6.

possible question type nor every question of Jesus in John.⁵⁷ To make things simple, I divide up the questions of interest into categories conforming to the general characteristics of question types.⁵⁸ This is done by chapters, ordered by intensifying rhetorical persuasiveness.⁵⁹ Within each chapter, I consider a number of more precisely defined question types in light of their logic, linguistics, history and rhetoric while staying close to the traditional view of informational and rhetorical qualities in questions. And I follow each type with a case study utilizing the questions of Jesus in John, aiming for brevity with each study.

⁵⁷ For example, there are many different types of questions Jesus does not appear to ask in the Fourth Gospel; notably, types such as *repair questions*, *agnoetic questions*, *lyric questions*, *quantifier questions*, *tag questions*, *phatic questions*, *indirect questions* or *counterfactual questions*, plus many, many more. Further, I do not interact with *riddles* in the Fourth Gospel. Tom Thatcher, who has written extensively on Johannine riddles, notes that while riddles in John possess some interrogative force, they are not formed as questions, and as such are beyond the scope of my work; see Tom Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 3, 67; and Tom Thatcher, *The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore*, SBLMS 53 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000).

⁵⁸ Remembering the sheer number of different question types, each with a myriad of different shades of meaning; see Leonardi and Santambrogio, "Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers," 459; and cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.6.

⁵⁹ I also tend to follow what I have come to call the 'EGH principle' of interrogatives: In dialogue, a question is best read with its maximum possible rhetorical force. I see this as a principle, not a rule, so I find it to be usually true not always true; see Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, and A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002), 43–44.

Question Types & Case Studies

Open Questions

Variable	Ch5	Case Study: 7:19c
Set	Ch5	Case Study: 8:46a

Reflective Questions

Indexical	Ch6	Case Study: 11:26b
Test	Ch6	Case Study: 18:4,7
Conditional	Ch6	Case Study: 3:12
Speculative	Ch6	Case Study: 6:62
Sequence	Ch6	Case Study: 1:38a
Expository	Ch6	Case Study: 8:43

Decisive Questions

Polar	Ch7	Case Study: 5:6
Alternative	Ch7	Case Study: 18:34
Deliberative	Ch7	Case Study: 18:11b

Responsive Questions

Opposing-Turn	Ch8	Case Study: 3:10
Echo	Ch8	Case Study: 13:38
Retort	Ch8	Case Study: 11:9a

Coercive Questions

Loaded	Ch9	Case Study: 9:35
NPI	Ch9	Case Study: 11:40
Biased	Ch9	Case Study: 8:10b

CHAPTER FIVE

OPEN QUESTIONS

There are two sides to every question.
—Protagoras

The most rhetorically undeveloped category of question is the *open question*. Of all the possible questions one may ask, questions with an open quality tend to have the least effect on both the listener and the reader. They are almost always informational and rarely rhetorical in quality.¹ Simply put, an open question is one without conditions or pretense. Open questions are the most neutral and the least persuasive for several reasons, having to do with the meaning and the manner in which they are asked.² There are two primary criteria that distinguish open questions from other types of more persuasive questions. First, to be open, a question must not include the opinion of the asker either implicitly or explicitly within the question.³ For example:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| (1) Who will win the game? | (Open question) |
| (2) Who will win any of the games? | (Non-open question) |

In (1), the question is truly open because the audience cannot perceive the view of the asker. However, in (2), the question is less open because the listener can perceive that someone or some team is losing or less likely to win (the word ‘any’ is a common negative polarizer). While the exact views of the asker may not always be obvious to the listener, the coloring that occurs in questions such as (2) does affect the listener.

Second, to be open, a question must not lead the listener toward or away from a desired answer.⁴ Open questions will not try to influence the audience either implicitly or explicitly. For example:

¹ Based on typical usage in typical situations. As the categories progress, they will increasingly become more likely to be used rhetorically—though with questions, always hard to pin down, there will always be plenty of exceptions for every rule.

² Although no question in natural discourse is truly neutral and non-persuasive; Eugene Litwack, “A Classification of Biased Questions,” *AJS* 62:2 (1956): 186.

³ Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 58. This is more of an ideal than a reality.

⁴ Han, “Interpreting Interrogatives,” 217.

- (3) Did the Cowboys or the Giants win the game? (Open question)
 (4) Didn't the Cowboys win the game? (Very non-open question)

In (3), the question has an open quality because the audience is not encouraged to want either the Cowboys or the Giants to win the game. This is in sharp contrast to (4), wherein the asker tries to lead the listener to agree with the asker: "Yes, (of course) the Cowboys did win the game." This points to another critical indicator of open questions: Open questions are always positive in their polarity.⁵

These examples are based on syntactic and semantic considerations more than pragmatic considerations. They assume that, if spoken, they would follow a normal prosody; an irregular prosody can render a normally open question as not open (with a stronger degree of persuasion). For example:

- (5) Did the COWBOYS or the Giants win the game? (Non-open question)

In (5), if the speaker emphasizes the word 'Cowboys' prosodically, then the question no longer possesses an open quality as the pragmatics try to influence the listener. Apart from pragmatics, open questions often struggle with ambiguity.⁶

When open questions occur in narrative, especially narrative discourse, they tend to have little persuasive effect on the reader. In many circumstances, open questions do not influence or sway the reader in any direction and only help to advance the plot. Among the questions we will consider they are by far the most 'neutral.' Perhaps not surprisingly, there are not a high percentage of truly open questions asked by Jesus in the Gospel of John. Two of the most commonly used questions with an open quality are *variable questions* and *alternative questions*. Examples of direct questions of Jesus with an open quality include John 8:10a and 10:32. Some of Jesus' questions—such as John 1:38a—have an unmistakable open quality but also have other qualities that trump the open quality. Since each of these questions is a "real" question—meaning a question used in a real way in a real text, and not a sample question created by linguists to show

⁵ Questions with negative polarity entail bias and therefore cannot possess an open quality. For example, "Who did Len call?" is open but "Who didn't Len call" is not (and not well-formed in English); see Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 64.

⁶ Van Eemeren, Grootendorst, and Henkemans, *Argumentation*, 138.

erotetic tendencies—each of these open questions may have a variety of effects on the reader but are not usually persuasive.

Variable Questions

A *variable question* is a question in which what is asked for is undetermined. Here the word ‘variable’ is used in the algebraic sense, meaning x ; another name for variable questions is x -questions.⁷ When an asker asks a variable question, the x that is sought from an audience can be derived from a nearly unlimited set of answers.⁸ Variable questions are a very common means of soliciting information from another person; they usually carry a very mild presumption that someone who hears the question will know the answer (or at least be willing to reply). They carry a strong informational quality, and only possess a noticeable rhetorical quality in unique situations. For example:

- (6) What is Diann’s favorite color? (Variable question)

In (6), the asker may not be seeking something as simple as ‘blue’ or ‘red’ but may desire to know that x is actually ‘magenta.’ Variable questions are one of the most fundamental types of questions, and they can be expressed even with one word.⁹ For example:

- (7) When? (Variable question)

One-word variable questions are limited to interrogative pronouns and adverbs.

Variable questions are almost always equated with *wh*-questions, and for our purposes, we will speak of variable questions and *wh*-questions synonymously.¹⁰ A *wh*-question is so named because in English they are

⁷ Karttunen, “Syntax and Semantics,” 4; and Diane Blakemore, *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, BTL (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 114.

⁸ Sarles, *Language and Human Nature*, 35; and cf. Karol Janicki, “The Ever-Stifling Essentialism: Language and Conflict in Poland (1991–1993),” in *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*, ed. Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven and Klaus-Uwe Panther, CILT 243 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003), 277.

⁹ Frederick L. Coolidge and Thomas Wynn, “Recursion, Phonological Storage Capacity, and the Evolution of Modern Speech,” in *The Prehistory of Language: Studies in the Evolution of Language*, ed. Rudolf Botha and Chris Knight, Studies in the Evolution of Language (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 250.

¹⁰ Not all *wh*-questions are variable questions, as we will see in later chapters, but what is similar is that a pure, unmodified *wh*-question is a variable question; see Huddleston,

formed with interrogative pronouns that all seem to start with the letters ‘wh’ (such as *who*, *what*, *when*, *where*, and *why*, plus *how*, the exception). For example:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| (8) Who are the Buckins? | (Variable question) |
| (9) Where are the Buckins? | (Variable question) |

These wh-interrogative pronouns/adverbs perform similar linguistic functions and in use are categorized together as types of wh-questions. This coincidence is also true in other Indo-European languages, including ancient Greek (although, coincidentally, ‘wh-’ words in Greek often begin with π). Wh-words specify interrogative force (both direct and indirect).¹¹ Variable questions usually occur with positive polarity.¹² Wh-words have other special properties in English and Greek but they are beyond our scope here.

Even though variable questions (without other qualities) generally have little power to persuade their hearers, they do possess other abilities that make them useful in narrative context. For example, wh-questions are especially good at generating information since they ask for someone to divulge additional facts, and as such, they are often referred to as information-seeking questions.¹³ Because variable questions seek information—to have *x* be determined—they are highly useful in language, and are infinitely adaptable.¹⁴ They are also infinitely atomistic, able to be partitioned repeatedly so as to get to the heart of a matter.¹⁵ Variable questions are also great for introducing an idea into conversation and standing at the

“Contrast between Interrogatives and Questions,” 417; and Koshik, *Beyond Rhetorical Questions*, 39.

¹¹ Andrew Radford, Martin Atkinson, David Britain, Harald Clahsen, and Andrew Spencer, *Linguistics: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge, 2009), 302.

¹² Negative variable questions are uncommon, except as indirect questions; see for example: Yam-Leung Cheung, “The Negative Wh-Construction” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2008).

¹³ Wang, “Questions,” 544. Again, this is not always the case as pragmatic and other factors may interfere and trump their information-seeking quality; see for example Hans-Georg Obenauer, “Special Interrogatives—Left Periphery, Wh-Doubling and (Apparently) Optional Elements,” in *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004: Selected Papers from Going Romance 2004*, ed. Jenny Doetjes and Paz González, CILT 278 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006), 247.

¹⁴ Their adaptability comes from the vague character of the interrogative pronoun; see Harrah, “Question Generators,” 607.

¹⁵ Prior and Prior, “Erotetic Logic,” 49; and Higginbotham, “Semantics of Questions,” 368–69.

beginning of a discourse.¹⁶ When a speaker uses a variable question with some degree of rhetorical quality, the quality is likely to be mild and the idea communicated to the audience is left open and impersonal.¹⁷ On a syntactic level, many questions in the Gospel of John appear to be variable questions, including John 1:38a, 2:4, 3:12, 5:44, 5:47, 6:5, 6:62, 7:19c, 8:10a, 8:43, 8:46b, 11:34, 12:27a, 14:9b, 18:4, 18:7, 18:21, 18:23, 20:15a, 20:15b, and 21:22–23, but many of these questions possess additional, noticeable qualities pushing them into another type of question. Variable questions with an open quality in John include only 7:19c, 8:10a, 11:34, 20:15a, and 20:15b.

Case Study: John 7:19c

τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι

Why [is it] me you seek to kill?

John 7 opens with a new scene wherein Jesus leaves Galilee in secret to go to Jerusalem during the Feast of Tabernacles (7:1–2, 10).¹⁸ There was a great deal of talk about Jesus among both the Judean leaders and the crowds of commoners in town for the festival (7:11, 12). The narrator informs the reader that the Judean leaders were hostile (7:1), but the crowds remained divided in opinion (7:12). About halfway into the festival, Jesus goes to the temple courts and begins to teach (7:14). The Judean leaders ask a question about the quality of Jesus' teaching (7:15), which results in a short monologue from Jesus addressing his qualifications. In the temple courts, in front of the crowd (composed of regular folks and Judean leaders), Jesus explains where his teaching comes from and how others can know this for a fact (7:16–18); he brings his argument to a climax with the highly persuasive question about the Law and its declarative implication (7:19a–b). But the monologue's conclusion in 7:19c brings it back down: "Why is it me you seek to kill?"

¹⁶ Janet Holmes and Tina Chiles, "‘Is That Right?’ Questions and Questioning as Control Devices in the Workplace," in *“Why Do You Ask?” The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*, ed. Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 192; Minchin, "Rhythm and Regularity in Homeric Composition," 36; and cf. Elisabet Engdahl, "Information Packaging in Questions," in *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics: Papers from CSSP 2005*, ed. Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr 6 (2006): 93–94.

¹⁷ For example, Barbara Johnstone, *The Linguistic Individual: Self-Expression in Language and Linguistics*, Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 148.

¹⁸ For the role μετὰ ταῦτα plays in configuring ancient narratives, see Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 153–56.

The questions of Jesus in John 7:19 involve a sophisticated, persuasive effect that is often overlooked in most readings of John. As I noted in Chapter 3, one common technique in the modern interpretation of the Fourth Gospel is to take questions and simply convert them into statements.¹⁹ This technique flourishes in critical readings of John 7:19c, but it fails to take into account what Jesus actually asks. Instead of making statements, as modern readers expect him to do, the Johannine Jesus punctuates his short monologue with the question of 7:19c. Both the monologue and the use of questions are logical and make good rhetorical sense, especially if we allow the questions to be questions.²⁰

John 7:19a is a negative polar question with strong rhetorical quality (see Chapter 8); its primary objective is to ask for agreement by coercing and pushing Jesus' listeners. By asking this, Jesus raises the emotional tenor of the discussion a great deal. This question is a rhetorical powerhouse. After forcing an unspoken answer upon his unwilling audience, Jesus follows up with a declaration that—due to its rhetorical position between 7:19a and c—must possess a high degree of exclamative quality. Jesus leads the declaration in 7:19b with the clarifying phrase οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν.²¹ This is important because he specifies, not generalizes, his exclamation by linking the failure to keep the Law to those in the crowd, not people in general.²² Then Jesus concludes with John 7:19c, τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι, an open question that seeks an answer.

Contrary to popular belief, John 7:19c is not a declaration—statement, argument, goad, charge or accusation—of any sort. Quite the opposite, it is in its nature a very elementary, information-seeking question. If Jesus had wanted to keep ratcheting up the rhetoric, as many commentators assume he does, he could have simply worded his argument that way. He doesn't.²³ Instead, the interrogative pronoun τί alerts the reader to the

¹⁹ As above, this practice is so rampant there seems little point in selecting examples when so many violate this most basic principle of language.

²⁰ For example, Raimo Hakola, *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*, NovTSup 118 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 131; and Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, BNTC 4 (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 249.

²¹ The correct answer to the question is ambiguous due to οὐδεὶς, a word containing a double bias (two negative polar items); for further discussion, see the case study on John 8:10b in Chapter 9.

²² If the purpose of the declarative was general, Jesus would have simply said: καὶ οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον (see for example, John 1:18 or 3:2).

²³ If Jesus had meant 7:19c as some type of accusation, he would have simply used a more-rhetorically appropriate form of question (or just a declaration). For example, he could have said: Οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον; καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον. οὐ με

presence of a variable question.²⁴ It is a question primarily designed to ask for information. Because of the emphatic use of the phrase οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν in the previous sentence, the pronoun με takes on additional importance here. In essence, Jesus asks the crowd, “Why me?”²⁵ The only complication that comes in at this point is the use of the verb ἀποκτείνειν, a word that is semantically-biased, which grants the question a slight rhetorical feel.²⁶

Here’s what happens: Jesus explains to the crowd his qualifications for teaching (7:16–18). Then Jesus asks them to agree with him—using a highly persuasive, perhaps even offensive, question—that they have the law and that they should already understand this. Without skipping a beat, he climaxes his argument and declares that not one of them present keeps the law. At this point, Jesus lowers the tone to earnestly ask them: Why is it me you want to condemn when you are equally condemnable?²⁷ Jesus uses a variable question that is almost plaintive to see what the people in the crowd will say.²⁸ Even as he knows he is not guilty, he wants to see whether (indirectly) they will admit their guilt or not. Of all readers, John Chrysostom pins it: Jesus checks his accusers while demonstrating his humility.²⁹ Therein we find the persuasive quality of this open question.

Finally, we can have confidence in Jesus’ logical use of a variable question in 7:19c by seeing how it works in relation to the answer in 7:20. The crowd’s response is to try to name Jesus an evil spirit, which comfortably matches the semantic focus of the original question.³⁰ Then they ask the question: τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτείνειν. Unfortunately, modern commentators write it off as a simple statement of denial but it is much more than

ζητεῖτε ἀποκτείνειν. But a skilled orator does not simply go up and up and stop there. Based on Jesus’ rhetorical ability to handle crowds, we would not expect him to do this either.

²⁴ As I discuss next chapter, sometimes interrogative pronouns (such as τί in Greek or wh- in English) can take on a slightly more rhetorical quality and move away from their basic, variable function. I will show this is not the case in John 7:19c.

²⁵ Cf. Wang, “Questions,” 533.

²⁶ Please see Chapter 9 for further discussion on biased words within questions.

²⁷ Glasson and Meeks are very likely correct in their recognition of an allusion to Deuteronomy in this argument; see T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, SBT 40 (London: SCM, 1963), 30; and Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, NovTSup 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 45.

²⁸ Because of Jesus’ epistemic supremacy, one could argue John 7:19c has some qualities of a test question; I do not feel this is strong enough to effect the primary rhetorical purpose of the question.

²⁹ Chrysostom, *Hom. Jo.* 49.

³⁰ Maziar Toosarvandani, “Association with Foci” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2010), 4.

that—it actually works in this situation as an opposing-turn question (as well as an echo question; we'll cover these types below).³¹ Since it is more likely in natural discourse for an opposing-turn question to follow an informational-quality question than a rhetorical-quality question, the crowd's use of an opposing-turn question is a likely reaction to being asked something they do not wish to answer and a way of returning the question back to the asker. This game the crowd plays then gives Jesus the freedom to restart his line of argumentation (7:21–24).

Set Questions

A *set question* is a question in which what is asked is limited by a set of possibilities. The set of possibilities is defined by the asker, and should not be construed as a set of answers (even though there may be some overlap). In English linguistics, set questions are often called *which questions*, since in English 'which' is the predominant interrogative pronoun for this type of question. Set questions in their natural form can function as open questions in the way variable and alternative questions can. As with other open questions, set questions typically possess a positive polarity. However, in contrast to variable questions and alternative questions, set questions without additional interrogative coloring are still slightly less open than other types of open questions. In most situations in natural discourse, they possess a strong informational quality, though they can occasionally carry a noticeable rhetorical quality. For example:

- (10) Which car will I buy? (Set question)

In (10), the set question is asked with the intent to discern the car I will purchase with the understanding that there are a limited number of cars possible for me to purchase. The speaker asks the hearer to respond from a pre-selected set (all cars currently made, cars for sale at a particular time, or more). For example:

- (11) What car will I buy? (Variable question)
 (12) Which car will I buy? (Set question)

³¹ Technically, an opposing-turn and echo question would follow immediately on the footsteps of the previous question, but in this situation, the use of *δαμόνιον ἔχεις* is probably some type of slur, which doesn't seem to break the dialogue enough to prevent the next utterance from being an opposing-turn/echo question.

There is a semantic distinction between (11) and (12). In (11), the ‘what’ signals a variable question and is fully open; there is no distinction in possibility between any two cars known or imaginable. However, in (12), the semantics change and the ‘which’ serves as a limiter. Set questions are useful when a speaker wants to instruct the audience to consider a set of possibilities rather than leave the question fully open-ended.

Set questions, in the absence of a strong rhetorical quality, are not often strongly persuasive to hearers in natural discourse, but they are quite capable of narrowing down a field of information sought by the asker. In many cases, they make the task of questioning easier for the audience. When set questions with weak rhetorical quality occupy the second-turn position, they can prove to be effective at challenging the first speaker or changing the course of the dialogue. When set questions have strong rhetorical qualities, they can be confrontational or condemnatory (“*Which one of you ate my chocolate cheesecake?*”). In both cases, however, the open nature of set questions prevents them from being good at persuading readers or hearers. From a syntactical viewpoint, set questions are much less common in natural discourse than variable questions or polar questions. In the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine Jesus only seems to use set questions twice: John 8:46a and 10:32.

Case Study: John 8:46a

τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας

Which of you convicts me of sin?

The dialogic scenes between Jesus and the Judeans in John 8 retain the common Johannine rhythm of question and answer.³² The scene is set in the area around the temple (8:20, 59), though without any notice of definitive temporal grounding. Jesus speaks to the people (8:12), but his comments open the door to a challenge-statement from the Pharisees (8:13; later Judeans, 8:22). After a lengthy back-and-forth that starts with questions (8:19, 22, 25, 33) but ends with declaratives (8:39, 41b), Jesus responds to the Judeans’ claim of relationship with God (8:41b) with a rebuttal of their paternity (8:42–44) and points out their inability to hear the truth (8:43–45). It is at the climax to this part of the dialogue that Jesus asks the set question of his audience, “Which of you convicts me of sin?”³³

³² Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 195.

³³ This verse is omitted in D; the most common theory being as a result of homoio-teleuton in 8:45–46.

When Jesus asks the question in John 8:46a, he strategically uses an open question to bluntly and brazenly challenge his opponents to answer—if they can.³⁴ First, this question is a set question that opens with the phrase, τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν.³⁵ Instead of simply asking the variable question, “τίς ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας,” Jesus selects the more pointed set question. Scholars debate whether the better understanding of ἐλέγχει is “convict” or “expose,” but due to some intentional ambiguity on the part of the narrator, this is a less important issue to the meaning of the question than typically assumed.³⁶ Either way, the choice of the verb ἐλέγχει adds a verbal bias to the question that causes the question to have a mild rhetorical quality built into it semantically.³⁷ Jesus’ use of the you-me correlation enhances the rhetorical quality even further. John 8:46a is not a ‘rhetorical’ question.³⁸ It very much does seek an answer. Instead, it is a question with a strong information-seeking quality and a mild rhetorical quality. This renders the question as a challenge meant to be answered. And it is not a general question, as the general-sounding περὶ ἁμαρτίας tends to

³⁴ John 8:46a is sometimes likened to *Gos. Thom.* 104, but there is too little similarity for any direct relationship; see Ismo Dunderberg, *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict? Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 112.

³⁵ Some scholars refer to this phrase as an “idiom,” but this is an imprecise label for the Greek construction, in light of the fact that there is no way to form the ‘which’ interrogative adjective usage in Koine. Many non-Western languages do not possess the high number of interrogative particles English does, and these types of constructions are more common in those linguistic contexts. This interrogative pronominal phrase occurs in Hag 2:3 (LXX) and Matt 6:27; and as a regular pronominal phrase in a few other places in the NT and LXX, including 2 Chr 36:23 (LXX) and Luke 11:5.

³⁶ Elizabeth W. Mburu, *Qumran and the Origins of Johannine Language and Symbolism*, JCTCRS 8 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 66. For those arguing for “convict,” see Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to John*, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 2:216; Segovia, *Farewell of the Word*, 229; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 71; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 148; and J. Terence Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, AnBib 57 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 24; and for those arguing “expose,” see for example, Barnabas Lindars, *Essays on John*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 17 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 26. The Vulgate renders ἐλέγχει as *arguet*; the Peshitta renders it as ܐܪܓܥܬ.

³⁷ For more information on bias in questions, please see below, especially Chapter 9.

³⁸ Contra Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, SP 4 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1998), 280; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:762; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 354; and David Pastorelli, *Le Paraclet dans le corpus johannique*, BZNW 142 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 136.

make readers believe—the question is very specific to this argument, even if the question plays with the ambiguity of word selection.³⁹

When the Johannine Jesus asks his audience, “Which of you convicts/exposes me of sin?” he does not ask for “who,” he asks for “which (of you).” The reason for this is the question is not intended to be as open as a variable question. Jesus is not asking the crowd to name anyone from the realm of all possible or imaginable worlds who could potentially convict/expose him of sin; he asks the crowd to name a specific individual who is there and present and can come forward to speak to the issue of his sin. By intentionally asking the question in this way, Jesus puts the burden of the challenge on his audience with his confrontational use of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν. Phrased another way, the question might expect no answer but not here—Jesus cannot confront his critics without some pause (even if narratives cannot record pauses).⁴⁰ In context, this question refers not to the general sense of sin, as in any possible infraction of the law, but more specifically to the sin of dishonesty/false witness.⁴¹

Why then do most modern readers assume Jesus speaks of sin in general here, when the singular ἀμαρτίας can easily go either way? When the specific sin of dishonesty is the implied meaning from both 8:45 and 8:46b? The reason is the bias toward propositions. Instead of reading a question, it proves too tempting to read the question as a proposition—as a declaration of the sinlessness of Jesus. It is not (primarily) a claim of sinlessness.⁴² What the narrator does here is much more powerful and persuasive than record Jesus making a claim of sinlessness. Such a claim would be extravagant, and anyone making any sort of extravagant claim can easily be disregarded; such claims are not persuasive. Instead, Jesus challenges his audience to come forward with any information that will prove him a liar. Posing a question, Jesus provokes his audience to consider and respond. If they cannot come up with legitimate evidence of Jesus’

³⁹ Here περὶ ἀμαρτίας acts as a mild indexical to reference dishonesty in 8:44–45; cf. George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2nd ed., WBC 36 (Waco: Word, 1999), 136.

⁴⁰ Whether someone in the audience would chose to respond to such a question is a different matter entirely; contra J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ICC (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1928), 2:315.

⁴¹ Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:402.

⁴² Contra, for example, Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 323; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, rev. ed. NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 412; and Forestell, *Word of the Cross*, 24.

dishonesty, then why can they not believe him (John 8:46b)? Jesus may aim this set question squarely at his opponents as a challenge for them, but in the hands of the narrator the question becomes an open challenge to engage all readers of the Gospel. A reader cannot read this passage and not wonder, "Can I prove Jesus a false witness?" And as the narrator suggests to the reader, "If not, then, I must believe" (John 8:46b).

CHAPTER SIX

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

Sooner or later I must face the question in plain language.
—C. S. Lewis

Perhaps the most frequently used questions in narratives and discourse fall into a category we will call reflective questions. A *reflective question* causes a reader or listener to stop and think. It is asked by the writer or speaker so that the listener or audience may consider that which is asked. As a category of questions, reflective questions encompass a large number of different types of questions, each with different nuances but all evoking thoughts from the hearer. In contrast to the more basic nature of open questions, writers create reflective questions primarily via semantic inference rather than simple syntax.¹ For example:

- (1) What do you want out of life? (Reflective question)
- (2) If I decide to walk, do you know the way? (Reflective question)

In (1) and (2), both questions are reflective questions. (1) is also a variable question, but it is not truly open for a reason that cannot be explained through grammar alone. In English, ‘out of life’ is an expression that paints a picture the hearer ‘enters’ upon hearing the question raised—even if the question is not posed directly to the hearer.² Likewise, (2) is syntactically a polar question, but the conditional phrase in the protasis colors the question so much that it overrides the basic character of polar questions. Let’s contrast these examples:

- (3) What do you want out of life? (Reflective question)
- (4) What do you want from the store? (Not so reflective question)

¹ See for example, Karttunen, “Syntax and Semantics,” 20.

² Suppose you are standing in line at a store, waiting to pay for your purchase. The person in front of you, while involved in the transaction with the store employee, leans forward toward the employee and says, “So, what do you want out of life?” You will not be able to avoid the question; it will invade your thoughts and cause you to think (as it would anyone familiar with the picture).

In the second set of examples, the (3) is a reflective question due to the coloring imposed by the semantic quality of the descriptor, but (4) is much less reflective due to its semantic content. Note that (4) is not devoid of reflective qualities; but all things being equal, in English it is not so reflective, even if a particular store is or is not identified. Another example:

- (5) If I decide to walk, do you know the way? (Reflective question)
 (6) Do you know the way to San Jose? (Not so reflective question)

In the third set of examples, the conditional phrase makes (5) reflective, but the limiter 'San Jose' in (6) prevents the same effect. Question (6) may cause a person to search their mind for information, but without further coloring, probably will not cause the person to ruminate for a long time over directions.

Unfortunately, because reflection is based predominantly on semantics, there is no definitive way to tell if a question is a reflective question outside of its narrative or discourse context. Unlike open questions, which are almost always positive in polarity, reflective questions can be negative (though it is not as common as the positive form). An example of a negative-polarity reflective question:

- (7) Why can't we move to Iowa? (Reflective question)

Within narrative, and especially discourse, reflective questions are often surprisingly simple to identify, especially for listeners well-attuned to the semantics of the given language. During the reading process, readers skim past technical parts of language and spend the most time on ideas of interest—and reflective questions spark interest by their nature.³ Reflective questions tend to be mildly persuasive in narrative. They are not commonly used with significant rhetorical quality. A speaker cannot use a reflective question to prove a point but can use it to sway the audience into further engagement and consideration.⁴ Their greatest power is their ability to work well even if asked indirectly or addressed to another hearer. There are quite a few different types of reflective questions asked by Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, including *indexical questions*, *test questions*, *conditional questions*, *speculative questions*, *course questions*, and *exposi-*

³ Ram, "Theory of Questions," 279.

⁴ Jauss, *Question and Answer*, 87; and Srikanth Sarangi, "The Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of Reflective Questions in Genetic Counseling," in *"Why Do You Ask?" The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*, ed. Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 237.

tory questions. The questions of Jesus in John with a strong reflective quality include John 1:38a, 3:12, 6:62, and 11:26b.

Indexical Questions

An *indexical question* is a question whose meaning pivots on an inserted indexical—a word or phrase referencing another, previous utterance typically (but not always) within the same narrative or conversation. Linguists sometimes refer to these kinds of referential markers as discourse anaphora, token-reflexives or demonstratives, depending on a variety of factors in their function. As indexicals resemble the way interrogative pronouns function in variable questions, they denote another variable that can exist within questions (or other types of sentences). However, an indexical is a different type of variable for the reader to decode than an interrogative pronoun. Whereas most languages have only a few, easily-identifiable interrogative pronouns and particles, all languages have a larger number of many different kinds of indexicals, all with varying degrees of indexical strength and referential power. Therefore, indexical questions are questions whose interrogative force is colored in a prominent way by the presence of an indexical. For example:

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| (8) Who said this? | (Indexical question) |
| x said y? | |

In (8), the word ‘this’ functions as a simple indexical. When a speaker asks this question, the indexical forces a hearer or reader to reference previous statements in the conversation or narrative (whether cognitively or physically locating it).⁵ While the *x* variable (interrogative pronoun) is completely open (could be anyone), the *y* variable (indexical) is limited to some previously-stated concept within the discourse.⁶ When this occurs, the indexical adds an extra focus-point into the question that would not

⁵ Example: “Mr. Burns trotted down the corridor of his plant while his employees assembled in the courtyard. Suddenly someone yelled, ‘You ol’ blowhard!’ ‘Who said this?’ snapped Mr. Burns.” In this example, the word ‘this’ indexes the event of someone yelling ‘you ol’ blowhard.’ The hearer must make the correct index or confusion occurs.

⁶ Nuancing this, John Pollock argues the *x* variable in variable questions are themselves indexical; I find this can be—but is not necessarily—true in some situations in natural discourse; see John L. Pollock, *Language and Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 255; and Franck Floricic, “Negation and ‘Focus Clash’ in Sardinian,” in *Information Structure and Its Interfaces*, ed. Lunella Mereu, Interface Explorations 19 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), 130.

normally be there.⁷ If the audience cannot locate the reference pointed to by the indexical, then there is misunderstanding. If the indexical reference is ambiguous, then there is confusion.

Indexical questions are closely related to both *ambiguous questions*, a type of question where there is an undefined variable,⁸ and *echo questions*, a type of question wherein the asker ‘echoes’ a previous thought or question.⁹ For example:

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| (9) Who said what? | (Ambiguous question) |
| <i>x</i> said <i>x</i> ? | |

In (9), the speaker intends the word ‘what’ not as an indexical but as an unreferenced variable.¹⁰ The question creates the ambiguous quality due to the nature of the interrogative pronoun ‘what’ embedded without direct reference.¹¹ As a result, indexical questions can be quite subtle in their degree of indexical strength, from little noticeable quality to highly ambiguous; they may rely on less obvious indexicals to raise the intended question. But not all questions with indexicals are indexical questions. For example:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| (10) Where is a boat? | (Variable question) |
| (11) Where is the boat? | (Variable question) |

At first glance (10) and (11) may seem almost identical, but the definite article acts as a weak indexical in certain situations. In a narrative, ‘the boat’ (11) typically indexes a specific boat whereas ‘a boat’ (10) does not.¹² If the reader has already encountered a boat previously, that boat will be the object of reflection. If the reader has not previously encountered a boat, then ‘the boat’ will cause the reader confusion (as well as reflection upon whether there is a missing boat). However, such weak indexicals do not normally skew the interrogative force of the question enough for us to treat these questions as indexical questions. Rather, (10) is a variable

⁷ Helma Dik, *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 130.

⁸ Higginbotham, “Interrogatives,” 201.

⁹ See Chapter 8 below.

¹⁰ When the context of the question implies, “Who said what (things)?” then the question drifts back toward an indexical quality.

¹¹ Eroteticians sometimes call ambiguous questions multiple wh-questions to emphasize the double variables; see for example, Zuber, *Non-Declarative Sentences*, 59.

¹² For more on this quality of the definite article, see Robin Clark, *Meaningful Games: Exploring Language with Game Theory* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012), 184–87; and Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 244–48.

question and (11) is a variable question with a weak indexical. Since there are quite a variety of different types of indexicals, there are also a variety of different ways in which questions handle indexicals (but this is beyond the scope of this work).

All things considered, indexicality is an extremely common aspect of language often with slight coloring but no significant rhetorical effect. Nevertheless, certain types of discourse (including rhetoric and narrative) do contain indexical questions that speakers employ as reflective questions. Anytime a speaker ‘shorthands’ a question and inserts an indexical, it will force audience members to search out the source of the reference.¹³ If this occurs during a debate or tense narrative dialogue, for example, the context will push the audience to recall the reference. Weak indexicals persuade a reader to give more thought to the question in order to cognitively form the reference link. At the same time, strong indexicals may force the question into displaying a strong rhetorical quality, and can even cause the listener to object (“Whaddya mean by ‘that’?”). While a number of Jesus’ questions possess indexicals, only a few possess an indexical quality evident enough to directly affect the interrogative. Questions with indexical quality include John 3:10 (ταῦτα), 6:5 (οἱ τοι), 6:61 (τοῦτο), 8:10a (εἰσιν), and 11:26b (τοῦτο).¹⁴

Case Study: John 11:26b

πιστεύεις τοῦτο

Do you believe this?

In John 11, the reader learns that Lazarus—someone who Jesus loved—has fallen sick (11:1–3). Against the counsel of his disciples, Jesus returns to Bethany in Judea to see Lazarus after a few days of discussion and delay (11:4–16). When Jesus and company arrive, they find that Lazarus has already been in the grave for four days. Mary and Martha, sisters to Lazarus, are in mourning, but when Martha hears of Jesus’ arrival, she goes out to meet him (11:17–20). Martha confronts Jesus about his absence, as she believes if Jesus had been present, Lazarus wouldn’t have died (11:21). Jesus responds to Martha, saying elusively, “Your brother will rise

¹³ This is a natural property of indexicals, with their reflective qualities magnified by their being raised within a question.

¹⁴ John 2:4, an idiomatic expression, contains an implied indexical. English translations insert the indexical ‘that’ in order to make the question make sense to modern readers. Similarly, John 21:22, 23 contain an implied indexical.

again" (11:23). Martha becomes confused at Jesus' point but affirms that her brother will rise again on the last day, to which Jesus now speaks plainly that he is the rising-again, that he is the life—a life everlasting that comes only through believing in him. Then Jesus simply asks, "Do you believe this?"

Based on the critical reception of John 11, Jesus' question in John 11:26b appears to be of no importance. Readers place a great deal of emphasis on Jesus' declaration (11:25–26a) and Martha's affirmation (11:27)—and rightfully so—yet I argue the tiny πιστεύεις τοῦτο makes all the difference. At first glance, John 11:26b is a very basic polar question asked by Jesus to prompt a decision from Martha.¹⁵ As I note below, polar questions typically carry a strong decisive quality—they ask for a person to confirm "yes" or "no." Since this is the question's base nature, it cannot deny it. Jesus uses a question of this type in this situation for this reason—he is looking for a definitive answer from Martha. Nothing less will do.¹⁶ However, there is a greater persuasive quality at play, one that I believe pushes the question back toward reflection; this is the presence of the indexical, τοῦτο. Only in this question in the whole Gospel of John does πιστεύω carry an accusative as direct object.¹⁷ Ironically, instead of giving the reader a substantive, Jesus only provides an indexical.

Even more ironic is the open-endedness of the indexical, as τοῦτο could potentially refer to anything, though most readers will refer it to Jesus' declaration. But this is exactly the persuasive power of the Fourth Gospel in action. Jesus makes an earth-shattering declaration, and follows it up with a rather devious question: "Do you believe *this*?"¹⁸ The Johannine Jesus could easily have asked, "πιστεύεις" and omitted the indexical, but doing so would have eliminated the reflective part of the faith for which Jesus asks.¹⁹ Jesus asks not for affirmation, but reflection, understanding, and commitment. He doesn't ask Martha to decide between "yes" or "no," but to decide between "yes" with understanding or "no" with understand-

¹⁵ For more on the persuasive role of polar questions, see Chapter 7 below.

¹⁶ Cf. Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 393.

¹⁷ Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 404; and Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:332.

¹⁸ Contra Schneiders, who claims the emphasis is on "you." Schneiders is correct in noting the pointed nature of the question, but the implicit "you" is secondary to the explicit "this"; see Schneiders, *Written That You May Believe*, 158.

¹⁹ Contra Dumm, who claims it would have been better for Martha to just answer "yes"; see Demetrius R. Dumm, *A Mystical Portrait of Jesus: New Perspectives on John's Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001), 157.

ing. Some hay has been made over the centuries about Martha's decision not to parrot back Jesus' exact words,²⁰ but this misses the point entirely. Jesus' goal with the question is to challenge Martha to search—and answer—for her faith.²¹ And the indexical question does just this, as the reader sees from Martha's thoughtful answer. Jesus' question functions as a climactic hinge between Jesus and Martha; it is the rhetorical glue sealing the declaration and the confirmation. Perhaps more importantly, Jesus' use of the indexical question pulls the reader in, and persuades the reader to consider what they believe, and to decide whether they believe *this* or not.²²

Test Questions

A *test question* is a question in which the asker seeks information from the audience for a purpose other than being informed of the answer to the question. There are two major types of test questions. In most cases, the asker knows the answer to the question but wants to determine whether or not the audience also knows the answer.²³ In some cases, however, the asker may ask merely to see what response it elicits from listeners—the asker may see if the listeners try to answer or what type of answers they give.²⁴ Test questions occur both in natural discourse as well as in more artificial forms of discourse (such as classrooms).²⁵ For example:

(12) Where was I born?

(Test question)

²⁰ For example, Chrysostom *Hom. Jo.* 62; and contra this, those encouraged by Martha's considerate response, Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 414.

²¹ Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to St John: With Maps, Notes and Introduction*, CBSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 236; and Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 489.

²² For those who see the persuasive power of this question pointed at the reader, see for example Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 324; and Sandra M. Schneiders, "Remaining in His Word: From Faith to Faith by Way of the Text," in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 267.

²³ In the fields of study comprising erotetics, test questions are usually referred to as *exam questions*. However, I use 'test' because when pragmatics come into play, one cannot describe the illocutionary act in English saying, "The asker *examined* the audience."

²⁴ Blakemore, *Understanding Utterances*, 114; and Angeliki Athanasiadou, "The Discourse Function of Questions," *Pragmatics* 1:1 (1991): 109. Thus test questions can touch up against *guess questions*.

²⁵ Searle, *Speech Acts*, 66; and Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 28.

In (12), since we can assume that any asker would know their place of birth, but the audience may not, asking this would most likely constitute a test question. Test questions are highly dependent on context and not identifiable on syntax alone. For example:

- (13) What is 2 plus 2? (Not a test question)

At first glance, the question in (13) appears to be a test question. It *is* a test question if posed to a group of 5 year olds; but posed to adults, it stops being a test question and leans into another category of questions (such as an *inapposite question*) as the answer would be obvious to both the asker and the listeners. For (13), it is not always the case it is not a test question, but it is almost always the case.²⁶

From the perspective of Greek rhetoric, test questions can encompass several forms of Socratic questions (ἐξετασις and ἔλεγχος).²⁷ However, they are by nature always informational in quality and never ‘rhetorical’ questions.²⁸ Test questions tend toward a high degree of reflectivity as they challenge the listener to think through possible answers. However, test questions are not omnidirectional in the same way as indexical questions; readers will not automatically be challenged by test questions embedded in narrative discourse (John 6:5 being a superb example of this). Test questions are a very common feature of institutional discourse, and exhibit a strong tendency towards power and control of the asker over the listener. The challenge for any audience hearing a test question is not only discovering the answer but understanding the intention (and therefore the desired answer) of the question asker.²⁹ Because of the nature of John’s Gospel—with Jesus presented as having epistemic supremacy (John 1:48; 13:1; 16:30; 18:4; 19:28; and 21:17) from the very beginning—many questions seem to possess a testing quality, although the most prominent examples

²⁶ The question “What is 2 plus 2?” could potentially be a test question among adults if the asker wanted to see how an audience responded to such a simplistic question—whether with sarcasm, jeers, feigned ignorance, or just silence. This usage is uncommon in natural discourse and rare in narrative situations.

²⁷ Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue*, 90, 97, 111, 133.

²⁸ ‘Rhetorical’ as in its common usage meaning a question not expecting an answer; cf. Bell, “Questioning,” 209.

²⁹ Mey, “Linguistics as a Practical Science,” 247; and Kepa Korta and John Perry, *Critical Pragmatics: An Inquiry into Reference and Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 87–88.

of test questions used by Jesus include John 6:5, 18:4, 18:7, 20:15a, 20:15b and 21:15–17.³⁰

Case Study: John 18:4b,7a

Τίνα ζητεῖτε

Whom do you seek?

After Jesus prays for the task before him, his disciples and everyone else who believes in him (17:1–26), the scene opens with him crossing the Kidron Valley with his disciples and stopping in an olive grove (18:1). This was a familiar olive grove, having been used before by Jesus' followers for meetings (18:2). Judas, the disciple who betrayed Jesus, comes at night directing a detachment of soldiers and assistants to the Pharisees and chief priests in Jerusalem (18:3). They come armed. At this point the narrator alerts the reader that Jesus, cognizant of everything that would take place, comes out of the olive grove alone and intercepts the company (18:4). From what John tells the reader, Jesus is the first to speak, and he asks, "Whom do you seek?" The reply from the company is simply, "Jesus the Nazarene" (18:5). In response, Jesus declares, "ἐγώ εἰμι." For reasons the narrator does not reveal, upon hearing his words the company, including Judas, fall back and fall to the ground (18:6). Again Jesus asks them, "Whom do you seek?"

The identical questions of Jesus in John 18:4b and 7a are profound on several levels. To begin with, readers have long recognized the similarities between the questions of Jesus in John 1:38a, 18:4b, 18:7a, and 20:15.³¹ Consciously or not, the repetition of these and other similar-themed questions

³⁰ Jesus' epistemic supremacy in the Fourth Gospel puts a distinct spin on most of his questions. For example, John 1:38a is semantically a speculative question (see below), but being asked by the Johannine Jesus, the reader is left wondering whether or not it is also somewhat of a test question, in that Jesus may intend to test and see how the two disciples will respond—and perhaps even that Jesus already knows what answer the two disciples will give. As a result, many of the questions of the Johannine Jesus come with a testing-type of spin that shapes the way the questions are read, heard and responded to by an audience. For Jesus' epistemic supremacy, see D. Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 124; Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 145; M. Sabbe, "The Arrest of Jesus in John 18,1–11 and its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Evaluation of A. Dauer's Hypothesis," in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*, ed. Marinus de Jonge, BETL 44 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987), 217; and cf. Augustine, *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 103.2.

³¹ For example, Adele Reinhartz, *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 2001), 119.

will cause a reader to reflect on these questions more than expected. It would be simple to pronounce these questions ‘normal,’ but they are more than that. They are not rhetorical questions.³² Breaking the question down, τίνα ζητεῖτε is syntactically a variable question, and in its base nature, has a strong open quality. Jesus’ choice of ζητέω sets up a noticeable verbal bias towards reflection (especially in John; see the case study on 1:38a, below). However, in this situation, the narrator tips the reader off prior to the question to let the reader know what kind of reflective quality the question possesses. In 18:4a, the narrator hints (unmistakably): “Jesus knows the answer.” And then in 18:4b, Jesus asks a question. The reader knows that Jesus knows the answer to this question; thus, we know that Jesus twice asks a test question to Judas and the company.

Why would the Johannine Jesus ask a test question here?³³ Since a test question is a question with a mixture of informational and rhetorical qualities, there is more than one answer. When Jesus asks, “Whom do you seek?” he is trying to persuade his opponents. Scholars have long noted Jesus’ control of the situation—his exiting the grove, his interception of the company, his speaking first.³⁴ Jesus’ questions further reinforce for the reader this sense of control. When test questions, as a common form of institutional discourse, take on any rhetorical quality, they are often used to assert interrogative pressure on their audience. Interrogative pressure, besides making the listener “squirm,” betrays the power inequity between the asker and the listener. The listener “squirms” because the asker has (or takes) the power to ask. Even though the power relationships in John are complex, not simple, Jesus asks test questions so as to assert himself over his opponents and to persuade them to both listen and respond.

³² Contra, for example, Udo Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, THKNT 4 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998), 263.

³³ Some readers may argue John presents Jesus as knowing the answers to most or all questions; therefore this is no more a test question than any other question Jesus asks. As I noted above, Jesus’ epistemic supremacy does tend to give many of his questions a mild testing quality. However, in every instance I identify as a question with strong testing quality, the narrator tips the reader off to that fact in a very overt way in the text. John 6:5 is the most obvious example of this, but the other questions are quite clear in their purpose.

³⁴ Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 109; Brodie, *Gospel According to John*, 525; Kenneth O. Gangel, *John*, HoNTC 4 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 331; and Tat-siong Benny Liew, “The Word of Bare Life: Workings of Death and Dream in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, SBLRBS 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 181.

When Jesus asks, “Whom do you seek?” he is also asking his audience for an answer. Within the narrative, his listeners answer his question by identifying the person they seek, Jesus the Nazarene. Some commentators argue the company’s answer is pejorative, and I agree, though not due to the use of τὸν Ναζωραῖον specifically.³⁵ It is a pejorative response because the reader knows that of all the appellations by which we could describe Jesus, the lowly τὸν Ναζωραῖον is not it. In other words, responding in this way does not make Jesus’ opponents inaccurate or incorrect per se; they simply do not see Jesus for who he is.³⁶ We know this because in the very next breath, Jesus informs them—bluntly—of a more appropriate answer: “ἐγώ εἰμι.”³⁷ Even more evident for the reader is that the chief priests’ and Pharisees’ company point to Jesus’ humanity, while Jesus affirms his divinity (18:6; cf. 6:35, 8:12, 8:58, 9:5, 10:9, 10:11, 11:25, 14:6 and 15:1). Jesus asks this test question to see what these men will say, and the reader realizes they answered poorly. Jesus’ questions persuade the reader to think carefully about who Jesus is (and not to offer the same answer).

Conditional Questions

A *conditional question* is a question whose meaning pivots on an attached conditional—a phrase or clause representing a possibility. Up to this point, most of the questions we have considered occur as simple questions, but conditional questions occur as complex questions. Whereas a simple question contains one illocutionary act, complex questions contain more than one illocutionary act.³⁸ In fact, conditional questions are always complex questions because of the required conditional clause (the protasis), a separate illocutionary act distinct from the interrogative but one that places a limit on (conditions) the question.³⁹ Since conditional clauses are easy to identify, we can usually identify conditional questions in a straightforward manner via syntax. In English, the appearance of the word ‘if’ in a clause is usually a clear indicator of a conditional question.

³⁵ For example, Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 507; and Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 485; and contra Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, ABC 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 2:810.

³⁶ Everything in the Fourth Gospel seems to come back to who Jesus is.

³⁷ Raymond F. Collins, *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*, LTPM 2 (Louvain: Peeters, 1990), 125.

³⁸ Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 4.

³⁹ James Isaacs and Kyle Rawlins, “Conditional Questions,” *Journal of Semantics* 25:3 (2008): 269–70.

Likewise, conditional questions in Koine Greek often employ the ‘εἰ’ or ‘ἐάν’ word to indicate a conditional clause.⁴⁰ For example:

- (14) If Noël is right, am I wrong? (Conditional question)
 (15) If Noël is right, who is to blame? (Conditional question)

The primary purpose of a conditional question is to ask a question that becomes relevant if and only if the condition is true. In (14), the question of whether or not I am wrong is only viable if Noël is right. If Noël is not right, then the conditional question is inoperative.⁴¹ This sets up the unique logic of conditional questions, in that conditional questions can be said to always have one extra answer than its non-conditional counterpart. In (14), the polar question “Am I wrong?” is normally answered “Yes” or “No,” but the question “If Noël is right, am I wrong?” allows for three legitimate answers: “Yes, you are wrong,” “No, you are not wrong,” and “Noël is not right.”⁴² Likewise in (15), the conditional question is based on an open question instead of a polar question, but it is still only operative if and only if Noël is right.

While an ‘if’ (‘εἰ’ or ‘ἐάν’) in a question is a strong indicator of whether or not the question is conditional, not all questions with an ‘if’ clause are conditional questions.⁴³ There are other special uses for ‘if’ clauses. For example:

- (16) If pigs could fly, could we ride them? (Counterfactual question)
 (17) If I had a million dollars, would I be rich? (Speculative question)
 (18) If the sky is blue, can we eat outside? (Causal question)
 (19) Whoever is talking, can you please stop? (Unconditional question)

In (16), the ‘if’ clause in the first question creates a *counterfactual question*, a unique kind of conditional question wherein the protasis does not correspond to the real world. Instead of a conditional clause, these types of questions contain a counterfactual clause. In (17), the ‘if’ clause makes the question appear to be a conditional question, but the question does not use the protasis to set up a viable condition; rather, it speculates on a possibility. These types of questions fit within the *speculative question*

⁴⁰ Prior and Prior, “Erotetic Logic,” 43.

⁴¹ Leonardi and Santambrogio, “Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers,” 457.

⁴² Isaacs and Rawlins, “Conditional Questions,” 274; although Isaacs and Rawlins argue against the ‘denial of antecedent’ option as a true answer; see also Prior and Prior, “Erotetic Logic,” 55.

⁴³ Belnap, “S-P Interrogatives,” 335.

type. (18) is a *causal question* since the protasis is not a condition.⁴⁴ (19), an *unconditional question*, possesses an unconditional protasis, which is a less common feature of natural discourse.⁴⁵ Beyond these four, there are other types of logical conditions that a speaker may add to a question. Last but not least, certain types of requests or disjointed questions may contain an ‘if’ and interrogative force but are not conditional questions (a great example being John 11:40).⁴⁶

Rarely, a speaker can ask a conditional question without an ‘if’ word, but such questions are usually not well-formed in English. For example:

(20) Should Noël be right, am I wrong? (Conditional question)

The question in (20) does ask a conditional question, but its formation sounds strange in English. There are no poorly-formed conditional questions of Jesus in John.⁴⁷

When a reader encounters a conditional question in narrative, he or she has to be careful to see whether or not the condition does or will hold true in the narrative world. If the conditional clause is or will be true, then the question causes the reader to reflect on the question in light of the condition being met within the narrative. This is the case even if the conditional question is polar; the audience must reflect on the condition before a decision can be made. If the condition is true, a speaker can use a conditional question to blunt the question, to save face due to a difficult situation, to take care not to offend, or for a variety of other acts designed to allow the reader to reflect on the situation before making a direct answer.⁴⁸ A speaker may also use a conditional question as an effective probe to garner specific information.⁴⁹ Conversely, when the condition is false, the question’s use in narrative becomes much more thorny. A speaker may use these types of conditional questions to mislead the audience (either in the narrative world, or in the case of an unreliable narrator, in the real

⁴⁴ To put it another way, the protasis of a conditional question *may* be true, but the protasis of a speculative question is *not* true, the protasis of a causal question is *always* true, and the protasis of a counterfactual question is *never* true (in this world).

⁴⁵ See for example, Kyle Rawlins, “(Un)Conditionals: An Investigation in the Syntax and Semantics of Conditional Sentences” (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Cruz, 2008), viii, 86–107.

⁴⁶ Barbara Dancygier, *Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge and Causation in Conditional Constructions*, CaSL 87 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 124.

⁴⁷ As I argue below, John 6:62 is a speculative question.

⁴⁸ Belnap, “S-P Interrogatives,” 337; and Bell, “Questioning,” 210.

⁴⁹ Herbert W. Simons and Jean G. Jones, *Persuasion in Society*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011), 458.

world).⁵⁰ False conditionals can create false presuppositions on the part of the asker, which can force a listener into making inaccurate statements, or convince a naïve audience that the listener is cornered. They can also be used in tactical argumentation to deflect corrections or attacks.⁵¹ Both the Johannine Jesus and his antagonists exploit the complexity of conditional questions in strategic argumentation throughout the Gospel of John. The conditional questions of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel include John 3:12, 5:47, 7:23, 8:46b, 18:23, and 21:22, 23.

Case Study: John 3:12

εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἂν εἶπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε

If I spoke about earthly things to you and you do not believe, how will you believe if I were to speak about heavenly things to you?

There is a man named Nicodemus, a Pharisee and a member of the Judean ruling council, who came to Jesus at night to tell Jesus that he must be from God (3:1–2). This begins a conversation in which Jesus tries to explain to Nicodemus using simple images from the world around them—such as birth and wind—how to enter the Kingdom of God (3:3–5). Nicodemus asks Jesus questions about this teaching as he does not seem to understand (3:4–9). Jesus asks Nicodemus how he can be Israel’s teacher and not understand what he is saying (3:10). Jesus then explains that no matter the kind of testimony offered, people like Nicodemus will not accept it (3:11). Then Jesus asks, “If I spoke about earthly things to you and you do not believe, how will you believe if I were to speak about heavenly things to you?”⁵² Following this question is a lengthier monologue by Jesus.

⁵⁰ Paul Dekker, Maria Aloni and Alastair Butler, “The Semantics and Pragmatics of Questions,” in *Questions in Dynamic Semantics*, ed. Maria Aloni, Alastair Butler, and Paul Dekker, CRiS/PI 17 (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2007), 15.

⁵¹ Leonardi and Santambrogio, “Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers,” 458.

⁵² Against everyone else, Gitte Buch-Hansen argues εἶπον should be understood as third person plural instead of first person singular; this is an interesting argument but this is not the ‘problem’ with the interpretation of John 3:12. The ‘problem’ with the interpretation of John 3:12 is that it is a question being interpreted by scholars as a proposition. See Gitte Buch-Hansen, *“It is the Spirit that Gives Life”: A Stoic Understanding of Pneuma in John’s Gospel*, BZNW 173 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 314.

A great deal of uncertainty exists over the reading of John 3:12.⁵³ In particular, scholars point to the potentially contrasting terms ἐπίγεια and ἐπουράνια, and almost always try to work backwards through the text for clues to the meaning of each of these terms.⁵⁴ I believe this misses the point. Almost without exception, modern scholars treat 3:12 as a proposition.⁵⁵ Obviously, it is not; it is a question. Nor is it simply a declarative in interrogative form. To understand 3:12, we must not ask what Jesus says but ask what Jesus asks. From this perspective, the question of Jesus in 3:12 leads with εἰ (in the protasis), pointing to a conditional question. Because the second clause (apodosis) opens with πῶς, we know it is a conditional question built on a variable syntax. To make things more difficult and unusual, there is a second conditional clause embedded into the apodosis, led by ἔάν and containing the subjunctive εἴπω. There is also the pointed and potentially emphatic use of the dative pronouns ὑμῖν. Let's break the question down further.

First, stripping away the conditionals, the root of the question Jesus asks is πῶς πιστεύετε. Here, in light of the context of the conversation, we see that Jesus is essentially asking a variable question (or, because of πῶς, a course question). These types of questions do possess an informational quality even when used to persuade.⁵⁶ To put it another way, Jesus could easily have asked, εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, ἔάν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύετε; rendering it as a polar question and raising its degree of rhetorical quality. Thus, we take the question at its syntax—Jesus asks this question to persuade Nicodemus to think about how it has come to this, how he can or cannot believe.⁵⁷ Jesus uses a question here not to assert anything to Nicodemus, but to confront him to reconsider his position.⁵⁸

⁵³ Ernst Haenchen, *John*, trans. Robert Funk, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 1:202; and Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 199.

⁵⁴ Godfrey C. Nicholson, *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*, SBLDS 63 (Chico: Scholars, 1983), 88.

⁵⁵ In my review of the relevant secondary literature, I was unable to find a scholar who addresses the interrogativity of John 3:12 in any capacity.

⁵⁶ A great example being Nicodemus' own πῶς question in John 3:9.

⁵⁷ On the implication of unbelief, see for example, David Rensberger, *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 53; and Leon Morris, *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 183.

⁵⁸ Most scholars claim Jesus asserts something here, but if that were true, John would have simply written εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, οὐ ἔάν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύετε.

Unfortunately (for modern readers), Jesus' question is not quite as simple as this. Because it is cast as a conditional question, we must now factor in the effect of the conditional clauses. One challenge here is to know for certain that the clause in the protasis (εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε) does in fact point to a conditional clause instead of a speculative (or counterfactual or causal) clause. Based on the arguments of many Johannine scholars as to the meaning of τὰ ἐπίγεια, it may not be conditional. Semantically, we can rule out a causal or counterfactual protasis.⁵⁹ Ruling out a speculative protasis is harder, especially since the second conditional phrase embedded in the apodosis does appear to be speculative. This—after we have rooted the discussion of 3:12 in its interrogative force—is where the accurate meanings of ἐπίγεια and ἐπουράνια come into play. Since context indicates ἐπίγεια refers to an earlier element of the conversation, comprehensible by Nicodemus, I lean toward seeing the εἰ-clause as conditional, not speculative.⁶⁰ In that case, Jesus asks Nicodemus to reconsider his previous position; he asks that if Nicodemus is unwilling to put his faith in the earthly things that Jesus mentions, then surely he cannot think he will put his faith in the heavenly things that Jesus could mention.⁶¹ Thus, John 3:12 is neither an observation, assertion or proof, but a question with noticeable informational and mild rhetorical quality that Jesus uses to challenge Nicodemus to rethink his (poorly thought out) position.⁶² And to challenge the audience to reconsider their

⁵⁹ Although, it would make for a very interesting argument if read as counterfactual. If so, Jesus would in effect be asking something along the lines of, "Even though I never told you about earthly things, how do you think I could ever begin to tell you about heavenly things?" The problem with this is that most scholars believe the earthly things are things about which Jesus already spoke to Nicodemus.

⁶⁰ I freely admit I may be incorrect here. If I am incorrect, then Jesus' question to Nicodemus becomes a persuasive pleading, something along the lines of, "Since I cannot tell you about earthly things, how can I tell you about heavenly things?"

⁶¹ Now we may bring in the point scholars make of the argument following an *a minore ad maius*, *qal vehomer*, or a *fortiori* reasoning—but not before we establish the appropriate force of the sentence. Also, here I follow C. K. Barrett's line of thought that πιστεύω in these situations in John means "put faith in" more than simply "believe"; see C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2nd ed (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 212.

⁶² I believe the repetitive use of ὑμῖν to keep bringing the point back to Nicodemus (and the audience!) is additional evidence of this line of argument; cf. Cornelis Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2:148 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 175; James F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology*, SNTSMS 111 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 212; and Brodie, *Gospel According to John*, 198.

positions as well. As Jesus asks to persuade, the reader begins to take note that these kinds of faith questions are at the heart of John's intent in the Gospel of John.⁶³

Speculative Questions

Speculative questions are questions either without answers or with answers not easily determined. Eroteticians—and people in normal conversation—often refer to speculative questions as philosophical questions or hypothetical questions.⁶⁴ Ancient thinkers regarded speculative questions as a type of *θέσεις* or *quaestio infinita* and placed them within the realm of philosophy or theology more than rhetoric.⁶⁵ In general, the asker does not know the answer to a speculative question, not due to ignorance, but due to the scope of the question asked. They often include metaphysical or whimsical questions; they are frequently looked upon as impractical or quixotic. There is no presumption on the part of the asker that a member of the audience will know the answer.⁶⁶ For example:

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| (21) Does God exist? | (Speculative question) |
| (22) If I had a million dollars,
would I be rich? | (Speculative question) |

(21) is a classic speculative question, as it is not answerable (or at least not answerable in a way many listeners would deem satisfactory). (22) is a speculative question not because it is unanswerable—though it is potentially unanswerable by the speaker and any hearers—but (also) because 'rich' is ill-defined in contrast to 'a million dollars.' One common 'tell' for speculative questions is the inclusion of broad, generic nouns or unquantifiable adjectives such as 'God' or 'rich' or 'life.'⁶⁷ As these examples demonstrate, speculative questions cannot be distinguished syntactically; they are primarily identifiable via their semantic content. For example:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| (23) Do dogs exist? | (Not speculative question) |
| (24) If I had ten dollars, would I be rich? | (Not speculative question) |

⁶³ John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 417.

⁶⁴ I have chosen to use 'speculative' instead of 'hypothetical' in order to preserve the usefulness of the rhetorical term, *ὑποθέσεις*.

⁶⁵ Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.5.5, 11, 14; and cf. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A805/B833.

⁶⁶ Blakemore, *Understanding Utterances*, 115; and Wilson and Sperber, "Mood," 93.

⁶⁷ Nermi Uygur, "What is a Philosophical Question?" *Mind* 73:289 (1964): 69.

Both (23) and (24) do not have strong speculative qualities. In (23), both the speaker and the listeners know the canine species exists; and in (24), there is no real debate about whether a person with ten dollars is rich ("No"). Speculative questions do not expect quick replies.⁶⁸ They also typically carry a positive polarity and are not asked on turn two.⁶⁹

Besides these general examples, there is another indicator a question may be speculative: using 'why' in a question (τί in the direct questions of Jesus in John). 'Why' questions lend themselves to speculation in many situations, and frequently the use of a 'why' question will reflect a meta-physical tendency.⁷⁰ One reason for this is they are typically not easy to answer completely.⁷¹ And one 'why' question normally leads to more 'why' questions.⁷² For example:

(25) Why do birds sing? (Speculative question)

While (25) may not be speculative in an ornithological context, it is speculative in any other context. Many 'why' questions in natural discourse possess a speculative quality, and this quality may be the question's strongest attribute.⁷³

Speculative questions may occur in narrative for a variety of reasons, but one of the most prominent reasons is their ability to cause the reader to stop and reflect on what is being asked.⁷⁴ Much like indexical questions, speculative questions have an omnidirectional quality that cause a reader to think about the question even if it is asked of a character within a narrative, not by the narrator to the reader. If the protagonist asks the antagonist, "Is love the most powerful force in the universe?" the semantic power of the question will force the average reader to reflect on the question. Speculative questions are highly 'debatable,' a quality that causes hearers to think about and select a response, even in the absence of evidence. At

⁶⁸ Cf. Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 106.

⁶⁹ "Turn two" refers to the second utterance in a typical conversational pattern; see Chapter 8.

⁷⁰ David H. Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Towards a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 14; and cf. Hintikka and Halonen, "Semantics and Pragmatics for Why-Questions," 645.

⁷¹ Matti Sintonen, "On the Logic of Why-Questions," *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association* (1984): 171.

⁷² Eric C. Brook, "The Interrogative Model: Historical Inquiry and Explanation," *JPH* 1 (2007): 146. Or as any parent of young children knows all too well.

⁷³ Of course, there are many other non-speculative uses of 'why' interrogatives. My intent is to show a general trend not make an exhaustive statement about 'why' questions.

⁷⁴ Sarangi, "Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of Reflective Questions," 237–39.

the same time, speculative questions can be used in narrative situations to introduce or stimulate a discussion (especially in first-turn position), to refocus a conversation or argument, or more sinisterly, to derail another's line of attack in an argument by creating a false front. In the Gospel of John, the only question with a strong speculative quality is John 6:62.

Case Study: John 6:62

ἐὰν οὖν θεωρήτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον

What if you might see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before?

During his public ministry, Jesus escapes the crowds for a time only to have them find him on the other side of the Sea of Galilee (6:25). Jesus encourages the people following him not to look for him because they want their belly filled, but to look for him because they want their lives filled by God (6:26–27). The crowd, skeptical, asks Jesus what great sign he will do for them to prove his words; they point out that Moses filled their forefathers' bellies with bread from heaven (6:30–31). Jesus reminds them it was God, not Moses, who gave their forefathers that bread, and tells them the bread of God is the one who comes from heaven giving life to the world (6:32–33). Now the crowd asks for this bread, too. So Jesus tells them that he is the bread of life who has come down from heaven, and that people must believe in him to have eternal life (6:35–40). At this the crowd starts grumbling because Jesus said he came down from heaven, when it was common knowledge he is the son of Joseph (6:41–42). "Stop grumbling," Jesus tells the crowd; then he explains to them that he is the bread of life—if anyone eats of him—his flesh—they will live forever (6:43–51). This sets off a big argument within the crowd (6:52). The narrator, adapting similar content from various parts of Jesus' ministry, cues up Jesus' teaching in a synagogue near Capernaum, where he says more plainly that anyone who wishes for eternal life must eat his flesh and drink his blood (6:53–59). The disciples object, saying that no one can believe this. Aware of his disciples' grumbling, Jesus asks them, "This offends you? Then what if you might see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before?"

For many critics, John 6:62 is an awkward question over which there is little agreement.⁷⁵ It is also a characteristic example of the tyranny of the

⁷⁵ Luther, *Luther's Works*, 23:160; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 177–78; Francis J. Moloney, "The Johannine Son of Man Revisited," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. Gilbert

proposition in Johannine interpretation. A surprising number of scholars render Jesus' question as if it were a literal declarative, but worse, almost all speak of it as if it were a theological statement. Rather than asking what Jesus asks, there is the tendency to only want to state what they think Jesus is trying to say theologically. There are two primary issues in coming to terms with what Jesus asks in 6:62; namely, how Jesus asks his question and what Jesus is asking by his question. These two issues are closely related to each other.

Jesus asks two questions in John 6:61 and 6:62 as a response to the disciples' grumbling and their own question, "This teaching is hard—who is able to listen to it?" Jesus' first question, "This offends you?" occurs in turn two as response to the disciples' question, and it is formed as a positive polar question. Therefore, Jesus probably asks this question as an opposing-turn question; with a mild informational quality (he wants to know whether or not his teaching offended them) and a stronger rhetorical quality (he wants to get them talking to find out whether or not these are their true feelings). Since the narrator makes no mention if one of the disciples tries to respond, he continues to Jesus' next utterance, also a question, "What if you might see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before?" The presence of the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ alerts the reader that this question is intended as a follow-up to the opposing-turn question (and that Jesus may not have desired to take a response from his audience). Tandem questions like these are a common rhetorical strategy in ancient discourse.⁷⁶ At first Jesus' second question may seem unusually formed. Syntactically, it does not seem to fit easily into one of the four basic question formations: polar, variable, set, or alternative. English translations usually add a "what" to the beginning of the question, but the "what" is not there as such in the Greek. The syntax is part of the problem for the reception of the verse among modern scholars, but not for the reason usually given. The standard approach to the verse is to see it as an example of *aposiopesis*, meaning a conditional utterance containing the protasis (the 'if' clause)

van Belle, J. G. Van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 193; Ludger Schenke, "The Johannine Schism and the 'Twelve' (John 6:60–71)," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper, BIS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 212; and Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 56 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 139.

⁷⁶ For example, I notice a pattern of dual questions, working in rhetorical tandem, throughout the dialogues of Plato. Elizabeth Minchin believes it is the predominant interrogative strategy in Homer; see Elizabeth Minchin, "Rhythm and Regularity in Homeric Composition," 32.

but omitting the apodosis (the 'then' clause).⁷⁷ The result is the sentence is considered "unfinished" or "elliptical."⁷⁸ However, this is not accurate.

So as not to quibble over grammar, I accept that by certain textbook grammatical expectations, a protasis needs an apodosis. However, in John's narration of natural discourse (not a primer on grammar), far too much is made over the supposedly 'missing' apodosis. This question is not a case of *aposiopesis*.⁷⁹ Looking at the question again, it is not formed as we would expect: It is obviously not an alternative or a set question, but is it a polar question or a variable question? Since it does not have an obvious variable, it looks like a polar question, and this is why a very common approach to the interpretation is to see the 'missing' apodosis as an either/or, yes/no indicator: Either, yes, the disciples will take greater offense, or no, the disciples will take lesser offense.⁸⁰ Instead, the typical English translation, "what if" is a more accurate understanding of the Greek ἐὰν οὖν. The question is a variable question—with a caveat—and thus the question does not ask the disciples to confirm whether or not they will be more or less scandalized. The caveat is that the variable is

⁷⁷ For example, Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 303; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 326; Köstenberger, *John*, 219; Martinus C. de Boer, *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*, CBET 17 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 104; Walter Bühlmann and Karl Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; Ein Nachschlagewerk* (Giessen: Brunnen, 1994), 59; Plummer, *Gospel According to St John*, 156; Peder Borgen, "John 6: Tradition, Interpretation and Composition," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper, BIS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 110; Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 68; and Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, 222.

⁷⁸ For example, Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:296; Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John* (London: United Bible Societies, 1980), 213; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (London: John Murray, 1892), 109; Francis J. Moloney, "The Johannine Son of Man Revisited," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. Gilbert van Belle, J. G. Van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 194; Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:326; Burkett, *Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, 139; and Paul Diel and Jeannine Solotareff, *Symbolism in the Gospel of John*, trans. Nelly Marans (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 158.

⁷⁹ For example, Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 294; and cf. Friedrich Blass and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §482, wherein Blass and DeBrunner state there is no *aposiopesis* in the New Testament "in the strict sense," only in the sense there are some conditional sentences with apparently missing apodoses.

⁸⁰ For example, Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 300–301; and Kevin Quast, *Reading the Gospel of John: An Introduction*, rev. ed. (Mahwah: Paulist, 1996), 56. Against this popular view, B. F. Westcott argues the question is not either-or but both-and, and the question intentionally oscillates between both answers; see Westcott, *Gospel According to St John*, 109; plus C. K. Barrett, *New Testament Essays* (London: SPCK, 1972), 60.

subsumed (literally in Greek, semantically in English) by the conditional. Thus the question is not missing anything, it is a speculative question.

Strict grammarians may not love speculative questions, but they commonly occur in natural discourse. They are a regular aspect of everyday dialogue:

- (26) What if I run to the store instead of you?
- (27) What if there is life on other planets?
- (28) What if you write a book on the Dead Sea Scrolls?

These kinds of speculative questions—(26), (27) and (28)—occur in everyday discourse and neither need nor require an apodosis. In contrast, I find that when *aposiopesis* does occur, it occurs with more specialized, non- or quasi-interrogative utterances such as threats and requests:

- (29) If you don't do what I say . . . !
- (30) If you will just listen
- (31) If you could lend a hand . . . ?

While *aposiopesis* does occur in natural discourse, it is far less common than a speculative question. This, coupled with the fact that *aposiopesis* does not fit the Johannine context, is a sure sign 6:62 is a speculative question.⁸¹

What then is Jesus asking with his question in John 6:62? Speculative questions, with their noticeable rhetorical quality, persuade people to think about the topic asked. They are broad, visioneering, hypothetical. This is exactly how the Johannine Jesus persuades his audience. The disciples grumble, and they ask, "This teaching is hard—who is able to listen to it?" Jesus opposes their question with his own question, "This offends you?" Without giving them a chance to respond—or ignoring their reaction—Jesus offers an immediate follow-up, "What if you might see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before?" Jesus uses a hypothetical argument to persuade his listeners to think bigger than they are thinking.⁸² His question pushes them to reconsider their petty grumbling and offense

⁸¹ Delbert Burkett argues 6:62 could be an exclamation, and at least one major English translation renders it as such. I certainly feel the question has exclamative force, but I am at this point not convinced the exclamative force surpasses the interrogative force; see Burkett, *Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, 138; but contra this view, Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:71.

⁸² For those who hint at the possible, hypothetical intent, see Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:296; Newman and Nida, *Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*, 213; R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 69; George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge

and to refocus on the next part of the dialogue.⁸³ For John's readers, Jesus' words have a related impact; they push the reader to rethink the possibilities Jesus offers—to overlook their offense and to see the bigger picture of life eternal.⁸⁴

Sequence Questions

A *sequence question* asks its hearers to explain in detail a course of action. Another name for this type of question in erotetics is an inquiry question.⁸⁵ A sequence question closely resembles an open question, as there are no syntactic differences between the two. While open questions do not presuppose any certain kind of answer, sequence questions presuppose an extended or detailed answer.⁸⁶ This holds true even if the question appears deceptively simple. Sequence questions often appear vague or broad in the same way as speculative questions, but the primary difference between the two is that speculative questions are wide-ranging with no definitive answer and sequence questions are wide-ranging with the expectation of a thorough answer. It is not unusual for a listener to reply to a sequence question with a list or a group of answers. Thus, sequence questions cannot be polar questions. For example:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| (32) What do you want out of life? | (Sequence question) |
| (33) What do you want for lunch? | (Variable question) |

The question in (32) exemplifies sequence questions in that it presupposes a lengthy answer in most contexts. The question is simple (one illocutionary act) but the answer is not intended to be simple. In contrast, (33) is not a sequence question because in most contexts it asks for a simple response. Of course, it is possible that context could dictate otherwise—(32) could be asked with the desire for a simple answer (perhaps in a game) and (33) could be asked with the desire for a full-course response (perhaps by a chef)—but such situations are rare and identifiable by

University Press, 1970), 23; and Jey J. Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background*, JSNTSup 158 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 207.

⁸³ Cf. Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:71.

⁸⁴ Francis Moloney calls it "high rhetoric," and Ludger Schenke says it "aims to be a convincing argument"; see Moloney, *Gospel of John*, 228; and Schenke, "Johannine Schism and the 'Twelve,'" 212; respectively.

⁸⁵ I avoid the more commonly used term 'inquiry' because it does not explain the semantics of the question and is redundant when used with the word 'question.'

⁸⁶ On comparative response times, see Dillon, "Questioning the Use of Questions," 163.

context. A reader cannot identify sequence questions with certainty via syntax; semantics and pragmatics are the determining factors. Negative sequence questions are uncommon.

There is one occasional ‘tell’ for sequence questions: The use of ‘how’ and to a lesser extent ‘why’ by a speaker may signal a sequence question. When a speaker asks a ‘how’ question (πῶς in the direct questions of Jesus in John), the audience generally expects a longer response (or even a speech) detailing a course of action or list of options.⁸⁷ For example:

(34) How can we get to Africa? (Sequence question)

In (34), the semantic implication of the question is an asking for steps or details—the questioner is not looking for a listener to respond simply with “a plane.” The asker is asking for a studied response.⁸⁸

Sequence questions, like speculative questions, are highly reflective in that they stop an audience and cause them to reflect on possible answers.⁸⁹ Sequence questions tend to be less omnidirectional than speculative questions, but even a non-directed sequence question embedded in narrative will provoke some thought from a careful reader. This is even true of mundane ‘how’ questions; narrative usage still requires a reader to stop and reflect (at least momentarily) on the course for the hearer of the question. Sequence questions have the semantic power to get an audience to think ahead to the future or to consider new options or new situations. By nature, sequence questions can never be rhetorical. In the Gospel of John, none of the ‘πῶς’ questions of Jesus possess a strong sequence quality as they have other uses, something we will see with more clarity in later chapters. The only true sequence question uttered by the Johannine Jesus is John 1:38a, which as a matter of significance, is also the very first question and the very first utterance of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Hintikka and Halonen, “Semantics and Pragmatics for Why-Questions,” 655; Anna A. Lamari, *Narrative, Intertext, and Space in Euripides’ Phoenissae*, Trends in Classics 6 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 95; and cf. Michel Buijs, *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse: The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon’s Hellenica and Anabasis*, MNS 260 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 89.

⁸⁸ Nicholas Asher and Alex Lascarides, “Questions in Dialogue,” *LP* 21:3 (1998): 237; and cf. Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 106.

⁸⁹ Sarangi, “Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of Reflective Questions,” 239.

⁹⁰ John 7:19c is an interesting case; stripped of its narrative context, it would lean toward being a sequence question, but in the manner that John employs it, it works much better as a variable question. This question serves as a reminder of the blur existing between the lines of all of the various interrogative qualities.

Case Study: John 1:38a

Τί ζητεῖτε

What do you seek?

The next day John the Baptist is at the Jordan River baptizing; two of his disciples are there with him (1:35).⁹¹ When John sees Jesus walking by, he shouts: “Look! It’s the lamb of God!” When John’s two disciples hear this, they drop what they are doing with John and start following Jesus (1:37). Jesus, noticing them following him, turns around and asks them: “What do you seek?”

Jesus’ opening words in the Gospel of John are a question. As the protagonist of the narrative, his words set the tone for everything that follows. As a result of the semantic overtones of the question in 1:38, “What do you seek?” commentators on the Gospel have long held that the question has a literal meaning for the characters in the narrative and an equally important theological meaning for the implied reader.⁹² For modern readers, it appears laden with a great deal of existential implications.⁹³ Scholars base this argument on Jesus’ use of ζητέω in a philosophical capacity.⁹⁴ While it is true that Jesus’ opening question does speak to the implied reader as much as to the embedded characters, the reason for this goes much deeper into the heart of the Johannine construction of persuasive discourse.

The word choice for Jesus’ question is simple: “What do you seek?”⁹⁵ Yet the simple words belay a much deeper context for the interrogative

⁹¹ For John’s use of the temporal marker to set the scene and organize the Gospel, see Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 157–59.

⁹² For example, see John Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, trans. William Pringle, Calvin’s Commentaries 17 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 1:70; Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 180; Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 1:308; Köstenberger, *John*, 74; Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 154–55; Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John’s Gospel*, NTR (London: Routledge, 1994), 15; Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1:78; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 117; Witherington, *John’s Wisdom*, 69; and Nicolas Farelly, *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2:290 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 22.

⁹³ Alan Culpepper labels it “one of the great existential questions of life,” see R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, IBT (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 122; and see also, Dumm, *Mystical Portrait of Jesus*, 93; and John F. McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1–4*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 150.

⁹⁴ Cf. Painter, “Inclined to God,” 354; Collins, *These Things Have Been Written*, 104; Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 117; and contra Bennema, *Power of Saving Wisdom*, 111.

⁹⁵ I am unpersuaded there is semantic or contextual evidence the question is “cold” or “aloof,” as per Rodney A. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*, SBLDS 67 (Chico: Scholars, 1982), 85.

force of the question. We notice Jesus forms the question with a *wh*-word (in this case, τί), meaning the question is at its base a variable question.⁹⁶ Since there are no other immediate issues, we can also determine that the question is to some degree an open question. Therefore we expect the question to possess a strong informational quality. We know Jesus asks his listeners to respond, to reply to what he asks of them. However, Jesus' verb choice plays an important semantic role in the formation of the question (both in Greek, as well as how it is read in English). Aside from modern existential expectations, the verb ζητέω carries in Koine Greek a sense of desire, to wish for or attempt to locate.⁹⁷ This sense is what drives the question toward a slight rhetorical quality as a sequence question.⁹⁸ When a person expresses what they wish or are looking for in a discourse where the speaker does not set any parameters, it is usually more complicated than a one-word answer and signals an inquiry.⁹⁹

Jesus persuades his listeners with this question in two major ways: To fill in the variable τί in the question and to reflect on the answer before answering. The question contains a subtle undertow pulling listeners away from the safety of a simple answer and toward the uncertainty originating from honest reflection. While there are theological implications to this, we want to be careful not to over-spiritualize or over-philosophize Jesus' question. We see the evidence for this reading of Jesus' question in the disciples' response: Instead of trying to answer the question—which would

⁹⁶ A few late manuscripts have τίνα (as in 18:4b, 7a) in place of τί, presumably either as a correction for consistency with later questions or to emphasize the Christological attributes of the gospel; see Collins, *These Things Have Been Written*, 102.

⁹⁷ Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, 2nd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1996), 1:289–90; and “ζητέω,” BDAG, 428.

⁹⁸ I am unaware of any scholar who argues the question is a *phatic question* (as a greeting, e.g., “What’s up?” or “How’s it going?”). If it were asked in any other narrative context, it *could* very well be a phatic question, and even in John we should not quickly dismiss this possibility. Against this is John’s repetitive use of ζητέω, probably the strongest evidence the question is not phatic (and a limited information on Koine Greek conversational slang). While I am not convinced 1:38a is a phatic question, the logical and linguistic evidence for it being phatic is stronger than we might assume. If 1:38a is phatic, when it is taken alongside of all of the other questions of Jesus, it would have *three* layers of meaning instead of the two layers normally ascribed to it: 1) Slang greeting, 2) Deeper meaning of desire for disciples, 3) Existential meaning of purpose for implied readers. Three layers in a phatic question is not uncommon in modern English. On phatic utterances, see James M. Wilce, *Language and Emotion*, SSCFL 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 81–82.

⁹⁹ Since sequence questions are defined by semantics, pragmatics and context—not syntax—they are more difficult to identify in narrative texts. However, John 1:38a is a pretty obvious example.

require a long and detailed response to answer with any integrity—the disciples chose to ask their own question (an opposing-turn question).¹⁰⁰ By asking an opposing-turn question, the disciples signal to Jesus they understand the question but need more insight/answers/ideas to be able to truly answer his question. They are persuaded by Jesus' question, but do not have the kind of answer for which he is looking. Jesus' question is also persuasive to the reader; as a sequence question, it asks the reader to reflect on what the reader is desiring in his or her life. Due to the mild rhetorical quality, pushing the question toward reflection, the implied reader understands an answer may not be immediately forthcoming but the question will linger in the reader's mind. John's persuasive use of interrogatives within the Fourth Gospel engages characters and readers alike to build from this opening point of reflection.

Expository Questions

An *expository question* is a question asked by the speaker in order for it to be answered by the speaker. In the ancient world, rhetoricians referred to expository questions as either *rogatio*, αἰτιολογία, *hypophora*, *anthypophora*, *percontatio*, *subiectio* or any other number of related terms based on a variety of circumstances.¹⁰¹ The purpose of an expository question is to prod and persuade an audience into being interested in the answer that the speaker wishes to provide for them. To put it another way, expository questions do not signal a request for information but a request to prepare for information as provided.¹⁰² For a question to be an expository question, it must be answered in some way by the asker immediately following the question.¹⁰³ Otherwise, an expository question looks syntactically and semantically like any other major type of question. They more commonly occur as variable questions than polar questions. For example:

- (35) What is the best kind of pizza? (Variable question)

¹⁰⁰ I explain opposing-turn questions below in Chapter 8.

¹⁰¹ As noted above, there was a great deal of disagreement about the meaning of rhetorical terms in the ancient world. This confusion continues to the present, as a quick search for the meaning of the term *hypophora* reveals. I use the term here in its most general sense of a speaker asking a question so as to provide an answer; see Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 334.

¹⁰² Wilson and Sperber, "Mood," 93; and Bell, "Questioning," 209.

¹⁰³ Blakemore, *Understanding Utterances*, 114.

Here (35) is an unremarkable variable question. It mildly expects someone in the audience to offer an answer (“Chicago deep dish, in my opinion”). Expository questions take this one step further by having the speaker answer the question in order to bring about a deeper reflection on the question at hand. For example:

- (36) What is the best kind of pizza? (Expository question)
I find that NY style...

In (36), the question is meant as an expository question because it is used by the speaker as a rhetorical tool to preface an answer. An expository question ‘sets up’ further exposition within the discourse. If the speaker just launches into the answer (“I find that NY style...”), it may seem presumptuous or unwarranted by an audience, so the speaker uses an interrogative to broach the subject. In English, when a speaker employs a question with expository quality, there usually is a prosodic shift from the exact same question asked in non-expository usage.¹⁰⁴

Sometimes confused with or lumped in with ‘rhetorical’ questions,¹⁰⁵ expository questions are mildly persuasive because of their semantic links with the remainder of the speaker’s speech-act. Where expository questions really shine is in their ability to make hearers be more reflective about a topic than otherwise warranted. The expository question evokes interest in the reader, whether or not the reader wants to be interested in the topic. Longinus argued the expository question created emotional interest in the subject where it might be lacking within the reader.¹⁰⁶ Quintilian believed expository questions made the dialogue “pleasant,” probably in light of its reflective quality.¹⁰⁷ Expository questions are most often found in the first turn of a dialogue sequence, and can be either a polar or a variable question syntactically. However, expository questions built on variable-question syntax often occur in regular dialogue, as their

¹⁰⁴ For example, if in English one asks “What is the best kind of *pizza*?” as a typical variable question (expected prosody) focus usually falls in the later part of the sentence; in contrast, “What *is* the best kind of *pizza*?” asked as an expository question usually places the focus earlier in the sentence to signal to the hearer that the asker, not the audience, will be providing an answer. While we do not know the prosodies of ancient Greek, based on our knowledge of Indo-European it is safe to assume there were pragmatic differences between many of the more persuasive sentence types in ancient Greek.

¹⁰⁵ Quintilian treats expository questions as one type of question designed to emphasize a point rather than gather information—a category erroneously labeled ‘rhetorical’ in many modern discussions; see Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.14–15; and cf. Cicero, *De Or.* 3.203.

¹⁰⁶ Longinus, *Subl.* 18.

¹⁰⁷ Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.14.

reflective quality is by nature more open and discursive; while expository questions built on a polar interrogative syntax are more comfortable in debate and argumentation, as polar expository questions come across as more ‘sharp’ or demanding (as we see from their inherent persuasive qualities in general). Within the Gospel of John, Jesus asks only one question with noticeable expository quality—John 8:43.

Case Study: John 8:43

διὰ τί τὴν λαλίαν τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκετε

Why do you not understand my speaking?

Returning again to the scene in John 8, the reader finds Jesus engaged in a dispute with the Judean leaders. As Jesus teaches, he brings testimony of himself for the audience (8:14), and his witness is the Father (8:18). His opponents challenge him on this, and he tells his opponents they do not know him or his Father (8:19). However, the Judean leaders do not understand what Jesus tells them (8:27). Jesus continues teaching and referencing the Father, which continues to confuse and frustrate the Judean leaders. To refute Jesus, they lay claim to a paternity of Abraham (8:33, 39), but Jesus disputes and rejects their claims (8:39–40). When the Judean leaders next claim God as their father (8:41), Jesus tells them God cannot be their father or else they would love him (8:42). Jesus then asks, “Why do you not understand my speaking?” followed by his answer, “Because you are not able to hear my word” (8:43).

Readers typically overlook John 8:43—choosing to focus on the more salacious 8:44—but in so doing, miss an important, persuasive point of John’s Gospel.¹⁰⁸ In response to the Judean leaders’ claim that their only father is God (8:41), Jesus’ direct response explains his descent from the Father (8:42). But then, Jesus alters course, asks a question, then continues back to the original line of argumentation until his turn ends. Why would a speaker do this? If we examine Jesus’ question in 8:43, we see at first that it is constructed as a variable question. There do not appear to be any other syntactical clues to its purpose. Turning to context, we see there is a very strong semantic link between the question in 8:43a and the declarative in 8:43b (that answers the question in 8:43a).¹⁰⁹ From a pragmatic view, the question carries little informational quality but a mildly

¹⁰⁸ Brodie, *Gospel According to John*, 331.

¹⁰⁹ Köstenberger, *John*, 266.

persuasive quality.¹¹⁰ We know we are dealing with an expository question of some degree.

Given the frequency of Jesus' questions in the Fourth Gospel, and his persuasive ability in asking questions, we might expect Jesus to use expository questions as a frequent rhetorical device. Socrates certainly did.¹¹¹ However, the Johannine Jesus does not, and even here the use of the expository question in 8:43 is somewhat atypical.¹¹² The most common use of expository questions is to lead a monologue; when used mid-monologue, its purpose is less grand and more pointed. This is magnified by the semantic link between *λαλῶν* and *λόγον*. While these two words do not setup a dynamic contrast as a modern understanding of language might allow, Jesus is clearly using a play on words/polished prose to drive his point home.¹¹³ Jesus uses the expository question of John 8:43a to challenge his audience to consider *why* they don't understand what he is saying—and once the audience begins to think about their answer, it allows Jesus to push them toward the answer he has for them: They cannot understand because they are *unable to hear*. Since seeking and believing (aspects of which include knowing and understanding) are foundational to the Gospel of John, Jesus' question motivates his audience to shift from unable to able to understand.¹¹⁴ For the reader, the question of Jesus is a flagged reminder of the crucial role of his word "as the boundary marker that signifies insider and outsider," the dividing line between those who are children of God and children of the devil.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ It is not a 'rhetorical question' because it is 'unanswered'—the question is answered, but by the asker, not the audience. The question is answerable by an audience.

¹¹¹ Wellman, "Socratic Method in Xenophon," 308.

¹¹² Contra George Hogarth Carnaby MacGregor, *The Gospel of John*, Moffat New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), 220.

¹¹³ Contra, for example, Newman and Nida, *Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*, 285; and pro, for example, Köstenberger, *John*, 266; and Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, 1:349–50.

¹¹⁴ As Rudolf Schnackenburg argues, "it is a question which constantly preoccupies the evangelist." See Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:332; and similarly, William Bonney, *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story as the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*, BIS 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 25.

¹¹⁵ Jaime Clark-Soules, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 298.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DECISIVE QUESTIONS

Quaestio . . . est appetitio cognitionis
—Cicero

In natural discourse, decisive questions are one of the more common categories of questions; but in narrative situations, their frequency decreases somewhat (even though they are still very common). A *decisive question* is put by an asker to prompt a hearer to select one or more options. As a category of the logical and rhetorical use of questions, decisive questions do not come in as many varieties as the other categories do, mostly on account of decisive questions' limited nature. In contrast to reflective questions, and much like open questions, decisive questions derive from syntax more than semantics, although pragmatics also play a critical role in the asking of decisive questions. For example:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| (1) Will you get the keys from Bubba? | (Decisive question) |
| (2) Will I get the keys from Bubba? | (Decisive question) |

In (1) and (2), the asker of both questions desires a response from a listener. In (2), the listener is probably the speaker, but a decision is still requested.

In direct narrative discourse, the hearer who must make a decision is the one embedded in the text. At the same time, much like reflective questions, questions with a decisive quality can also challenge a reader to reflect on and, consciously or not, make a decision based on the question asked in the text. They often persuade a listener to think on and decide on an issue or circumstance. For example, suppose within narrative discourse a reader reads:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| (3) Will you ever visit Iceland? | (Decisive question) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|

With any well-written narrative, a decisive question embedded within the narrative still prompts the reader to respond to the question during the reading process ("Yes, I will"). Therefore, while some decisive questions can approach true neutrality (informational only, with minimal leading or presuppositions), other types of decisive questions will frequently have a mild or even strong rhetorical quality.

Not all decisive questions call for a decision in the same way. For example:

- (4) Will you pass the salt? (Decisive question)

(4) is an example of the classic *request question*.¹ In natural language, when a speaker asks this question, the speaker is hoping for a request to be completed and not an answer given (not “Yes, I will pass the salt.”) However, since many modern eroteticians focus on answers, they miss the language game embedded in the question: It is a question, and it does call for a decision, whether that decision is an action or an answer, in either direction. Request questions therefore do fall within the category of decisive questions, though they do not generally carry with them a rhetorical push within the narrative for a decision by a reader. This distinction is important since our primary goal is to focus on the logical and rhetorical effects of questions in ancient narrative.

Syntax plays an important role in the determination of the interrogative quality of decisive questions. As a general rule, *wh*-questions are usually not decisive questions. For example:

- (5) Who will win the World Series? (Open question)
(6) What clothes will you wear? (Open question)

Both (5) and (6) may appear to be decisive questions—as they ask their audience to decide on a team and decide on an outfit—but their open quality trumps their decisive quality.² This distinction can be clearly seen in this example:

- (7) Who will win the World Series? (Open question)
(8) Will the Astros win the World Series? (Decisive question)

Here (8) calls for a decision (“Yes, I think so!”), whereas (7) merely asks the listener to choose one of many options (“The Cardinals, or maybe the Red Sox.”). Also unlike open questions, decisive questions can possess either

¹ There is a great deal of debate as to whether a polite request should be counted as a question, an imperative (i.e., “Give me the salt.”), or some other type of speech-act. It is not uncommon for requests to be treated as pseudo-questions or ‘false questions’; see for example Genette, *Fiction and Diction*, 44. The reason for the debate boils down to pragmatics—different requests in different contexts will carry with them very different pragmatic forces.

² Fales, “Phenomenology of Questions,” 73.

a positive or negative polarity.³ Negative decisive questions often fall into one of the more highly persuasive categories we'll see in a later chapter.

Whenever a reader encounters a decisive question, persuasion begins to inform the reading process. This is because the narrative is indirectly—sometimes directly—asking the reader to make a decision. Decisive questions answered by a reader or listener will directly shape the reading process *and* will unequivocally shape the attitudes and opinions of the reader or listener after the encounter with the text. The rhetoric of prompting a decision shapes the audience's view. As we will see below, this phenomenon is especially at play within John; a fact that informed readers will not find surprising (John 20:31). Within the Fourth Gospel, there are only two types of questions that call for a decision: *polar questions* and *deliberative questions*. The questions of Jesus in John with a compelling decision-asking quality include John 1:50, 5:6, 6:67, 9:35, 11:26b, 13:38a, 16:31, 20:29a, and 21:15–17.

Polar Questions

A *polar question* asks the listener to choose between two opposing possibilities. Here the word 'polar' implies diametrical opposition, though as we will see, natural discourse is much messier than this term implies. In English, polar questions are more commonly called *yes/no questions*, although eroteticians call them *confirmation questions* or *choice questions*.⁴ As one of the most common types of question, a polar question derives its interrogativity primarily from pragmatics with some emphasis from syntax and semantics. In many languages, it is possible to describe a polar question as any utterance with interrogative force that is without a wh-particle. For example:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| (9) Can Ken drive a jeep? | (Polar question) |
| (10) Should Ken drive a jeep? | (Polar question) |

In both (9) and (10), the speaker asks any hearers to come to a decision: affirmatively, yes, Ken can/should drive a jeep ("Yes"); and negatively, no, Ken cannot/should not drive a jeep ("No"). These two diametrically-opposed options create the polar conditional in polar questions. When

³ Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 64.

⁴ See Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 10; and Douglas Walton, *Dialog Theory for Critical Argumentation*, Controversies 5 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), 22, respectively.

it comes to the rhetoric of calling an audience to a decision, polar questions with decision-eliciting qualities typically possess a positive polarity.⁵ Because of their unique (and severely limited) force, polar questions are the most primitive species of questions. In many languages such as English and Greek, simply uttering a noun phrase with interrogative force (and no *wh*-) is enough to be heard by the listener as a polar question. For example:

- | | |
|--------------|------------------|
| (11) Dinner? | (Polar question) |
|--------------|------------------|

In (11), one word (with appropriate interrogative force) is all it takes to establish a polar question.⁶ In this situation, syntax meets pragmatics by limiting the nature of what the speaker asks—although any replies by an audience may not accept this limitation.

The elementary nature of polar questions makes them more difficult to identify in some languages (such as ancient Greek). Because polar questions do not typically come with an overt syntactical marker (as do variable questions), because questions in narratives have limited pragmatic information, and because Greek does not have a concrete word order to handle polar questions, determining whether a sentence in ancient Greek narrative is declarative or polar interrogative (or somewhere in-between) is treacherous. This can be easily illustrated in English:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| (12) Will you pick up dinner? | (Polar question) |
| (13) You will pick up dinner. | (Declarative) |
| (14) You will pick up dinner? | (Polar question) |

In these examples, (12) and (14) are polar questions.⁷ However, the only difference between (13) and (14) in this example is force.⁸ While the form of (14) is less common in English, it is more common in ancient Greek as

⁵ Below I argue the logic and rhetoric of polar questions with negative polarity are even more persuasive than calling for a decision—they are some of the most coercive types of questions askable.

⁶ See for example, Emma L. Pavey, *The Structure of Language: An Introduction to Grammatical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 290; Tatham and Morton, *Expression in Speech*, 385; Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 7; Adam Makkai, “Where Do Exclamations Come From?” in *Linguistics and Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Rulon S. Wells*, ed. Adam Makkai and Alan K. Melby, CILT 42 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985), 446–47; and contra Aristotle, *Cat.* 1b25–2a10.

⁷ The last question in this example is also a declarative question, a question type very difficult to identify definitively in ancient Greek (compared to English).

⁸ Lyons, *Semantics*, 2:754. In English, note the rising pitch contour for the interrogative in (14).

our thought experiment in Chapter 1 revealed.⁹ In most Indo-European languages such as English and Greek, polar questions have further distinctive properties but these are beyond the scope of our work.¹⁰

The standard logical explanation for polar questions is that they permit two possible answers: positive (“Yes”) and negative (“No”).¹¹ While polar questions do allow an asker to predispose a positive or negative option for an audience, polar questions in natural discourse actually allow for a variety of relevant answers.¹² For example:

- (15) Will the Cowboys win the Super Bowl? (Polar question)

In (15), a hearer or reader may answer ‘yes,’ or ‘no,’ or they may answer ‘I don’t know’ or ‘maybe’ or ‘who cares?’ or remain silent or give other responses that would not be considered meaningful answers in erotetic logic but are still very real and relevant answers in natural discourse.

Polar questions can have informational or rhetorical qualities, but in their most basic form, they are typically more informational and less rhetorical. Polar questions look simple—especially having only two primary answers—but they have some of the most implicit linguistic baggage of any question type.¹³ The most important baggage carried by polar questions is their typical display of bias.¹⁴ Bias is the projection of the intentions of the asker; these implicit intentions can subtly persuade listeners.

⁹ But this illustrates a serious weakness of using English interrogatives as examples of Koine Greek interrogatives. The reason why the last question in this example is less common in English than Koine Greek is because it is a less common form of syntax in English. In English this question is a polar question based on syntax and a declarative question based on syntax. Because Koine Greek does not share the same syntax as English, in Greek this question would be a polar question based on syntax and a declarative question based on force (*not syntax*). This makes the identification of declarative questions much more difficult in Koine Greek than English.

¹⁰ For example, see Hudson, “Meaning of Questions,” 13–15; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 186; Jerrold M. Sadock and Arnold M. Zwicky, “Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax,” in *Language Typology and Description: Volume 1, Clause structure*, ed. Timothy Shopen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 1:181–91; and Trine Heinemann, “Questions of Accountability: Yes-No Interrogatives that Are Unanswerable,” *Discourse Studies* 10:1 (2008): 55–71.

¹¹ For example, see Walton, *Dialog Theory*, 22; Isaacs and Rawlins, “Conditional Questions,” 273; and Higginbotham, “Interrogatives,” 214.

¹² Edda Weigand, *Dialogue—The Mixed Game*, *Dialogue Studies* 10 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010), 182; Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 10; and Ginzburg, “Interrogatives,” 403.

¹³ Cf. Carlson, *Dialogue Games*, 82.

¹⁴ D. A. Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, CTL (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 245; Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 232; and cf. Liddicoat, *Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, 112; and Robert Truswell, *Events, Phrases, and Questions*, OSTL 33 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 180.

In fact, unless we artificially eliminate pragmatics, we cannot ask a polar question without some degree of bias; there are no truly neutral questions.¹⁵ And even if we eliminate pragmatics (or mute them as in ancient narratives), we may not be able to identify the exact bias in a polar question, but we still know there is some type of bias. Understanding the bias is often the key to understanding the meaning of a particular question. Polar questions also carry the built-in presumption the audience knows the answer to the question.¹⁶

As a result of their distinctive characteristics, polar questions have a variety of useful functions. One is simply to confirm a suspicion or to find out if something is true or false.¹⁷ Speakers often use polar questions in institutional situations as a way of diagnosing a problem, narrowing a topic, or examination.¹⁸ Polar questions can not only encourage a decision, they can function in certain situations as weak leading questions.¹⁹ They also are a frequent tool of rhetoric and argumentation, as Aristotle points out in his discussion on dialectic.²⁰ Due to their primitive syntax, polar questions represent slightly more than half of the questions of Jesus in John, including John 1:50, 3:10, 4:35, 5:6, 6:61, 6:67, 6:70, 7:19a, 7:23, 8:10b, 9:35, 10:34, 10:35–36, 11:9a, 11:26b, 11:40, 12:27b, 13:12, 13:38, 14:9a, 14:10a, 16:19, 16:31, 18:11b, 20:29, 21:5 and 21:15–17.²¹ However, many of these questions possess additional qualities that transcend the basic form of the polar question. Those questions with a strong decisive quality include John 1:50, 5:6, 6:61, 6:67, 8:10b, 9:35, 11:26, 20:29 and 21:15–17.

Case Study: John 5:6

θέλεις ὑγιὲς γενέσθαι

Do you want to be made healthy?

After a change in scene, Jesus journeys to Jerusalem to take part in a feast and passes by the Sheep Gate (5:1).²² The narrator provides the reader

¹⁵ Litwack, "Classification of Biased Questions," 186.

¹⁶ Hudson, "Meaning of Questions," 11.

¹⁷ For example, Wilson and Sperber, "Mood," 95; and Fiengo, *Asking Questions*, 55.

¹⁸ For example, Wang, "Questions," 533; and Demetrius, *Eloc.* 279.

¹⁹ For example, Walton, *Media Argumentation*, 240.

²⁰ Aristotle, *An. post.* 77a28–32.

²¹ I list Johannine examples of polar questions this way since, of all types of questions, polar questions are the hardest to identify definitively within ancient Greek narrative.

²² On the scene change and feast, Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 153–56.

with a piece of important background information: Near the Sheep Gate there is a pool of water surrounded by five colonnades around which many sick and disabled people lay (5:2–3). The narrator also tells us that one of the disabled was ἀσθενεῖν for thirty-eight years (5:5). Presumably as Jesus passes by, he sees the disabled person lying there and knows his condition is a long-term debilitation—then without notice he asks the sick man, “Do you want to become healthy?”

Jesus’ pointed question to the sick man is often read as an oddity as it is dissimilar to other interactions Jesus has with the people he encounters.²³ In an attempt to understand Jesus’ logic in leading with a question, critics often resort to reading into the passage to speculate on the intent.²⁴ This is not necessary, if we assess the interrogative force of Jesus’ question in its natural sense. Looking at the question in John 5:6, it is plainly a polar question with positive polarity.²⁵ Since it is a simple question, and we know it is not possible for a polar question to be truly neutral, any bias in the semantics of the question will be pivotal. Unfortunately, there is little bias to which we can point—the only possibility is in the word ὑγιής. Since anyone with any degree of compassion would want another person to be healthy, it is possible to perceive a slight bias from Jesus’ expectation of a positive answer. Such bias is so mild that it is better to speak of Jesus asking the invalid a simple, sharp, polar question.

As a very elementary form of erotetic logic, a polar question asks for a positive or negative response, and this one is no different. Johannine scholars typically confuse the erotetic logic of Jesus’ question by examining the sick man’s answer and reading it back into the question, but this is a mistake. Jesus asks, “Do you want to be made healthy?” because he is calling the sick man to decide: “Yes” or “No.” It is not an offer of healing.²⁶ He does not ask πῶς θέλεις ὑγιής γενέσθαι, as we might expect if we start with the man’s answer. Why would Jesus ask such a question?

²³ Hakola, *Identity Matters*, 114.

²⁴ Against this tendency, Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 243; and Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 323.

²⁵ As noted in previous case studies, due to Jesus’ epistemic supremacy, many of his questions seem to have a quality similar to a test question. John 5:6 is no different; while I do not feel it has a noticeable test quality, I believe it is quite plausible to read it as a mild test question. If so, this would nuance (not undermine) my current reading of the question.

²⁶ Contra Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 194; and Hermann Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, NTD 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 97.

Jesus wants a decision.²⁷ Jesus' question is a confirmation question; it is a request for the sick man to confirm whether he wants to be made healthy or not.²⁸ However, the sick man does not answer with a "yes" or a "no"—evidence we are on the right track. When a person asks another person a polar question, there are several types of possible replies. Typically, when a person does not want to answer a direct polar question in natural discourse, they give a "non-answer," usually a lengthy reply that never really moves in any direction towards "yes" or "no." These types of answers are especially indicative of power-imbalance questioning, such as what occurs in institutional discourse.²⁹ In this situation, Jesus calls for a decision, but instead of choosing, the sick man hedges his bet. The persuasive force of this question is not lost on the reader of the Gospel of John. Just as Jesus calls for a decision, πιστεύεις (1:50) and οὐ γινώσκεις (3:10), here we feel the persistent rhetoric of Jesus' words asked of the sick man subtly tug at the reader.

Alternative Questions

An *alternative question* is a question asking for a decision between two or more options. Alternative questions stipulate the alternatives in the asking—either *x* or *y* (or *z* or more).³⁰ They are similar to polar questions, in light of their push for a listener to choose. At the same time, alternative questions are similar to set questions as they provide an audience with a set of answers from which to choose. Without other noticeable qualities, alternative questions function as decisive questions in that they allow

²⁷ Antoine Isaac Silvestre de Sacy, as cited in Mark Edwards, *John*, Blackwell Bible Commentaries (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 65; and cf. Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 137.

²⁸ Interestingly, studies show modern physicians overwhelmingly use positive polar questions to confirm patients' state and to work toward diagnosis; see for example, Elliot G. Mishler, *The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of Medical Interviews* (Norwood: Ablex, 1984), 62–63.

²⁹ Great examples of this occur in political and medical discourse. For example, when a journalist asks a politician a polar question, the politician will often talk about the question in a lengthy fashion but never actually give any indication they lean toward "yes" or "no." Likewise, in medical discourse, doctors very frequently use polar questions as a diagnostic tool with patients, but in return, patients sometimes offer explanations or stories rather than a "yes" or "no" when the doctor's question becomes personal.

³⁰ Lauri Karttunen explains that a two item (*x* or *y*) alternative question asks between four different possibilities: *x*, *y*, *x* and *y*, or neither *x* nor *y*; see Karttunen, "Syntax and Semantics," 15; also Maria Aloni and Paul Égré, "Alternative Questions and Knowledge Attributions," *PQ* 60:238 (2010): 20; Prior and Prior, "Erotetic Logic," 52; and Weigand, *Dialogue*, 183.

freedom of decision within the possible alternatives.³¹ To be a decisive question, the alternative question cannot try to influence the audience or betray the asker's perspective. Like polar questions, alternative questions are not truly neutral but they do typically avoid any overt bias. Therefore, alternative questions tend to have an informational quality. They are similar to decisive questions in their strength of persuasion when they act informationally in narrative or discourse.

There are two primary ways to distinguish alternative questions via syntax. The first way is if the question contains a disjunctive word. For example:

(16) Did the Cowboys or the Giants win the game? (Alternative question)

(17) Do you want coffee, tea, Coke or lemonade? (Alternative question)

In (16), the presence of the disjunctive conjunction 'or' in any interrogative sentence (η in New Testament Greek) is a good sign the question is probably an alternative question. When asked, both (16) and (17) set up a series of alternatives for the audience from which they may pick. Again, like polar questions, other answers are available (for example, with (17): "Neither" or "All of them" would work). While almost all questions with 'or' (η) are alternative questions, exceptions do exist.³²

The second way to distinguish alternative questions is through the presence of the interrogative pronoun, 'whether.' For example:

(18) Do you know whether the Cowboys won? (Alternative question)

Here (18) sets up an alternative question with the knowledge of the win on the one hand and the lack of knowledge of the win on the other hand.³³ In English, the use of 'whether' is probably more common among indirect questions than direct questions, but the same is not always true in other languages. In a sense, this question is still disjunctive as it could also be asked, "Do you know whether the Cowboys won *or not*?" Alternative questions are positive in polarity.³⁴ When a question with a disjunctive

³¹ Wilson and Sperber, "Mood," 96.

³² Stivers and Enfield, "Coding Scheme," 2622.

³³ Of course, the second example is slightly less open than the first example due to qualities that go beyond the alternative question, notably the presence of an epistemic verb.

³⁴ Negative-polarity alternative questions are more persuasive due to the negative bias and therefore could not be considered an open question.

structure is asked with a negative polarity, audience members no longer hear the question as decisive (stronger informational quality) but as coercive (stronger rhetorical quality).

Alternative questions work in narrative as their name suggests: They allow the asker to put forward two or more alternatives for the audience to decide between. Without additional qualities, alternative questions are probably the best way for a speaker to present alternatives without coloring the question asked. Alternative questions help both the speaker and the audience to consider possibilities and options.³⁵ They can introduce new possibilities into the discussion at hand.³⁶ At the same time, they also clarify discourse, correct misunderstandings and serve a repair function in conversation.³⁷ When imbued with a noticeable rhetorical quality, alternative questions allow a speaker to create a dilemma for an audience. The speaker may then use this dilemma to gain a persuasive advantage. A specialized use of the alternative question in the ancient world was known as a *dilemmaton* (διλήμματον).³⁸ A *dilemmaton* occurs whenever a speaker asks two questions or proposes two alternatives that oppose each other so as to make a listener choose one or the other, but are both easily refutable by the speaker.³⁹ In the Gospel of John, there is only one direct alternative question spoken by Jesus, John 18:34, a question calling for a decisive response from its listener(s).

Case Study: John 18:34

ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις ἢ ἄλλοι εἰπόν σοι περὶ ἐμοῦ

Do you say this on your own behalf, or did others say this to you about me?

After Jesus' arrest in the dark of night, some of the Judean leaders lead him to a questioning steered by Annas, a high priest (18:12–14, 19–23), and

³⁵ Minchin, "Rhythm and Regularity in Homeric Composition," 36.

³⁶ Aloni and Égré, "Alternative Questions," 3.

³⁷ Koshik, *Beyond Rhetorical Questions*, 111, 121–24; and Elizabeth Minchin, "The Words of Gods: Divine Discourse in Homer's *Iliad*," in *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion*, ed. A. P. M. H. Lardinois, Josine H. Blok, and Marc G. M. van der Poel, vol. 8 of *Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World*, MNS 332 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 25–26.

³⁸ Hermogenes, *Inv.* 192.11–194.1 (Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, 168–71); and cf. Socrates' use of the figure, Plato, *Euthyphr.* 10a1–4.

³⁹ Lucia Calboli Montefusco, "Rhetorical Use of Dilemmatic Arguments," *Rhetorica* 28:4 (2010): 364–65. The opposition of the alternatives are not necessarily diametrical; see Blinn Ellis Combs, "Plato's *Euthyphro*: An Examination of the Socratic Method in the Definitional Dialogues" (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2011), 214.

after this, to another questioning, this one steered by Caiaphas, the high priest for the year (18:24). The narrator splits the action between the interrogation scenes and the fate of Peter in his denial of Jesus. The narrator does not recount the questioning Jesus endures at the hands of Caiaphas (18:28). Following this second questioning, some of the Judean leaders now lead Jesus away from Caiaphas and to the palace of the Roman governor, Pilate. Morning has risen, and the Judean leaders accompanying Jesus do not enter into the palace so as to remain clean and able to eat the Passover (18:28). Pilate comes out of his residence and asks what charges are brought (18:29). The Judeans give a non-answer; Pilate is unimpressed and tries to dismiss them (18:30–31). The Judean leaders try to explain to Pilate the capital nature of the case, and the narrator lets the reader know that it must happen this way in order for Jesus to die the death he himself foretold. Pilate returns inside his palace, calls for Jesus to be brought in, and asks him, “You are the King of the Judeans?” (18:33). Instead of answering Pilate’s question, Jesus asks a question back to Pilate, “Do you say this on your own behalf, or did other say this to you about me?”

By treating John 18:34 as a propositional response rather than a question, readers and critics of John miss the formidable force of the language game cunningly played by both Jesus and Pilate. In 18:33, Pilate opens the interrogation with the simple, sharp polar question, *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*.⁴⁰ Since positive polar questions are never truly neutral, Pilate’s polar question probably betrays a bias toward a “no” answer based on the semantics of *σὺ* [emphatic] . . . *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*.⁴¹ Of greater interest is that Pilate’s question is formed with *εἰμί*; polar questions built on the verb ‘to be’ tend to emphasize their decisive quality even more than average polar questions.⁴² So Pilate is using a sharp question to pin

⁴⁰ By now we understand Pilate’s question could be read with declarative force: “[So] You are the King of the Jews.” While this is entirely possible, I do not believe there is enough evidence to treat it as propositional, and even if it were, it would not much affect my reading of 18:34.

⁴¹ Robert Gordis argues ancient Hebrew often omitted the negative item in polar questions when the rhetorical intent was obvious; it is possible to see Pilate’s questions as quite rhetorical, though I do not believe this is the most likely purpose. See Gordis, “Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences,” 214.

⁴² This is due to the ontological priority of the verb ‘to be.’ For example, if I ask a person, “Do you want to come?” the person knows they must decide, and I may apply mild (or strong) pressure pragmatically. However, all things being pragmatically equal, if I ask “Are you coming?” the person knows they must decide now and will feel coerced into deciding one way or another. Bottom line is polar questions with the verb ‘to be’ amplify the push for a decision more than polar questions without the verb ‘to be.’

Jesus down on whether or not he is the King of the Judeans. Of course, the reader is probably aware Pilate's question is meant as something of a trap for Jesus.

Not to be outdone by Pilate, Jesus sees Pilate's trap and ups the ante with an even more wily trap. Instead of answering (or giving a non-answer), Jesus asks a question in response to Pilate's question.⁴³ Syntactically, Jesus' question is uncommon in that it is formed as an alternative question.⁴⁴ At its core, Jesus' question has an informational quality; Jesus seeks some type of response from Pilate. We also see immediately that 18:34 is an opposing-turn question as well. Even though opposing-turn questions possess a strong rhetorical quality, I believe the alternative question form in this case trumps all the other interrogative qualities.⁴⁵ If so, what Jesus asks Pilate—with multiplied rhetorical force—is to make a decision between whether this claim is ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ or ἄλλοι εἰπόν σοι. Jesus calls Pilate to decide.

Jesus' question, however, is not that simple.⁴⁶ Pilate asks Jesus to choose; Jesus does not choose and instead fires back for Pilate to choose.⁴⁷ Jesus, skilled at this game, does not ask Pilate with a polar question, but with an alternative question.⁴⁸ Jesus' use of an alternative question sets up a dilemma for Pilate. Jesus tries to corner Pilate into either *x* or *y*.⁴⁹ If *x*, the 'King of the Judeans' charge is Pilate's own idea; the implication is the charge is at best baseless due to lack of evidence or at worst spurious due to Pilate bringing his own charge. If *y*, the 'King of the Judeans' accusation is someone else's idea; the implication is the charge is at best base-

⁴³ The Synoptic Gospels omit the first exchange between Pilate and Jesus, and jump straight to Jesus' admission of kingship; see Matt 27:11, Mark 15:2, and Lk 23:3.

⁴⁴ Reductionist eroteticians claim alternative questions are logically reducible to disjunctive polar questions, where the question asks, "Is *x* yes/no or is *y* yes/no." I believe this case study shows why this reductionist strategy does not work on questions in natural discourse with appropriate pragmatics.

⁴⁵ Under normal circumstances, since an opposing-turn question has—on average—a stronger rhetorical quality than an alternative question, we should examine it as an opposing-turn question (i.e., according to its strongest quality). However, alternative questions with strong rhetorical qualities are uncommon, and I believe in this particular situation that the alternative quality overrides the opposing-turn quality.

⁴⁶ Cf. Marc E. Pratarelli and Adam Lawson, "Conjunctive Forms and Conditional Inference in Questions and Statements," *NAJP* 3:3 (2001): 415.

⁴⁷ Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 593.

⁴⁸ In a general sense, my reading shows the accuracy of Paul Duke's prospect of irony in this exchange; see Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 129. To me, it is ironic in that neither Jesus nor Pilate will admit who will be in control of the interrogation (though Jesus eventually relents).

⁴⁹ Alternatively, Jesus tries to corner Pilate into either *+x* or *-x* and *+y* or *-y*.

less because it is hearsay and at worst impotent as it would make Pilate look as if he follows orders from the chief priests. Thus, as an opposing-turn question, Jesus' question is pushy; as an alternative question, it calls Pilate to decide; but as a διλήμματόν, it sets a cunning, rhetorical trap for Pilate.⁵⁰

We can have confidence in this reading in light of Pilate's answer. Pilate, also skilled in popular argumentation, neither answers Jesus nor gives him a non-answer.⁵¹ Instead, Pilate responds by asking yet another sharp, polar, opposing-turn question with the verb εἰμί. Pilate is unwilling to walk into the trap set by Jesus, and tries once more to wrest control of the situation from him. Pilate finally manages to do this by altering course in the dispute (18:35–37). Later, Jesus concedes him the victory by admitting his kingship (18:37). The reader, lobbied repeatedly through the use of questions within the narrative by the protagonist, experiences in a small way the challenge of answering the question, "Do you say Jesus is the King of the Judeans, or is it only others who say it?"

Deliberative Questions

A *deliberative question* is a question asked of oneself. To put it another way, an asker asks a deliberative question when the asker directs the question primarily toward themselves. Traditional grammars often call them *subjunctive interrogatives*.⁵² While modern eroteticians often ignore them, deliberative questions were an important type of question in ancient thinking.⁵³ Deliberative questions are first and foremost persuasive; they are a call for decision from within.⁵⁴ A speaker often uses a deliberative

⁵⁰ Though Jesus lived a century before Hermogenes wrote his rhetorical manuals, one of Hermogenes' examples of a διλήμματόν (reworked from Demosthenes) is very close semantically to John 18:34; see Hermogenes, *Inv.* 193.4 (Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, 170–71). Not to mention Jesus' question fits exactly Hermogenes' parameters for a διλήμματόν.

⁵¹ We know Pilate has some skill due to his position, duties in that position, probable amount of minimum education required for that position, and the evidence given in the gospel accounts. Andrew Lincoln still feels Pilate is now on the defensive; see Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 461.

⁵² William W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1879), 182–83.

⁵³ Plato, *Theaet.* 189e–90a; and Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.11–12.

⁵⁴ Renford Bambrough, "Gods and Giants," *The Listener* (July, 1951); Bertram Bandman, *The Place of Reason in Education* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1967), 24; and J. M. O. Wheatley, "Deliberative Questions," *Analysis* 15:3 (1955): 50.

question to weigh or ponder an idea or a plan.⁵⁵ They can make up a part of an individual's inner, personal dialogue and in some cases, the articulation of this dialogue to others.⁵⁶ They are usually not metaphysical in quality.⁵⁷ The clear indicator of a deliberative question is that it is asked in the first person, though not all first-person questions are deliberative.⁵⁸ For example:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (19) Shall I go to the prom? | (Deliberative question) |
| (20) What should I wear to the prom? | (Deliberative question) |

Here both (19) and (20) are deliberative questions within the context of a speaker seeking answers primarily from within. Unlike many other types of questions, deliberative questions do not seek information or make requests but encourage decision-making.⁵⁹ Deliberative questions are rarely encountered 'out loud' in common spoken discourse, but they are a common type of question in narrative, even at times spoken 'out loud' within the narrative discourse. When a deliberative question is spoken 'out loud' by a character in a text, it is often the narrator using the questions as a characterization device to allow the reader insights into the speaker's world. For example:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| (21) Should I stay or should I go now? | (Deliberative question) |
|--|-------------------------|

In (21), the narrator can use this simple deliberative question asked by a character to show fear, timidity, indecision or other emotions in a palpable way.

In English, speakers use certain words and clause constructions to indicate the question is deliberative when read or asked out loud (for example, 'shall' or subject-verb inversion in polar interrogatives, 'it is I?' instead of 'is it me?'). Ancient Greek, however, differs in its indication. Unlike Latin and English, where deliberative questions are almost always asked with a positive polarity, Greek deliberative questions have a tendency to

⁵⁵ Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, 9.

⁵⁶ H. Paul Brown, Brian D. Joseph, and Rex E. Wallace, "Questions and Answers," in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, ed. Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, TLSM 180.1 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), 1:507.

⁵⁷ Wheatley, "Deliberative Questions," 54.

⁵⁸ McKay, *New Syntax*, 94; Wheatley, "Deliberative Questions," 53; and Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898), 78. Occasionally, writers use the expression 'deliberative question' to mean any question that evokes an argument (deliberation). This definition is not meant here.

⁵⁹ Brown, Joseph, and Wallace, "Questions and Answers," 1:507.

be asked with a negative polarity (e.g., John 18:11b).⁶⁰ Deliberative questions often carry a strong rhetorical quality, but still may possess a mild informational quality. Deliberative questions can occasionally have an exclamative quality; whenever this is the case, however, the exclamative does not trump the fundamental interrogative force of the question.⁶¹ Plus there are a number of other less common functions for deliberative questions beyond the scope of this work.⁶² Examples of questions the Johannine Jesus asks with a noticeable deliberative quality include John 6:70, 11:40, 12:27a and 18:11b.

Case Study: John 18:11b

τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ οὐ μὴ πίνω αὐτό

Should I not drink the cup that the Father has given me?

Jesus, knowing his arrest was imminent, leaves the olive grove in the dark of night to intercept Judas who was leading the band of soldiers and Judean officials (18:2–4). After an exchange between the company and Jesus over the identity of the person they were seeking, Jesus again identifies himself for them and requests that they let his disciples go free (18:8). The narrator lets the reader know that this too was foretold by Jesus (18:9). Suddenly, Peter draws a short sword, slashes, and severs the ear of a servant of the high priest (who the narrator tells the reader is named Malchus) (18:10). Jesus demands Peter sheathes his sword, and then asks, “Should I not drink the cup that the Father has given me?”

Jesus’ question in John 18:11b is more complicated than readers assume. Critics almost always read the question as either a confident declarative or a ‘rhetorical’ question, though it is neither. There are several factors about the question that catch our attention. First, the root of the question is “Should I not drink?” (οὐ μὴ πίνω αὐτό), meaning Jesus asks the question in first person—a less common way of asking questions. Instead of asking

⁶⁰ Herbert Charles Elmer, *A Discussion of the Latin Prohibitive: Based Upon a Complete Collection of the Instances from the Earliest Times to the End of the Augustan Period* (Baltimore: Friedenwald, 1894), 38.

⁶¹ Contra examples given by Edwin Abbott; see Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 191.

⁶² For example, David Lightfoot, *Natural Logic and the Greek Moods* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 72; and Ashton Waugh McWhorter, “A Study of the So-Called Deliberative Type of Question (τί ποιήσω;) as Found in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides,” *TPAPA* 41 (1910): 157, 166–67. McWhorter pinpoints at least seven different types of deliberative questions, plus notes that many of the nuances of these types of questions cannot be adequately conveyed in English.

someone else, he asks himself, even if it is in the midst of conversation with Peter. Second, the main verb $\pi\acute{\omega}$ is subjunctive; these two clues are enough to signal to the reader that this is in fact a deliberative question. Third, Jesus forms the question as a polar question, emphasizing the call for a decision. Fourth, the question contains the rare $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ negation, probably meant as a sign of emphasis.⁶³ Fifth, the question comes mid-dialogue, or more accurately, at the end of a scene, leaving a little bit of an edge for the reader. The question has minimal informational quality, and a strong rhetorical quality.

Far from the ‘cool, confident’ Jesus who resolutely marches to glory, Jesus’ use of a deliberative question here is precisely to show himself as conflicted about his fate.⁶⁴ Jesus does not enter into glory lightly. Jesus asks a deliberative question in order to reveal his internal struggle, and to persuade an audience of the reality of that struggle. Occasionally, critics argue Jesus’ use of $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ in the question points to a strong rejection of uncertainty and is tantamount to a positive declaration of his calling.⁶⁵ However, this view misreads the syntax; Jesus asks a question, not states a declarative.⁶⁶ The emphasis of the $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ is on the negation of subjunctive $\pi\acute{\omega}$, meaning Jesus is deeply chastened over the issue of drinking the cup. The fact that Jesus moves toward positive resolution and acceptance of the Father’s plan only underscores the anguish within Jesus’ soul. Such an interpretation may seem odd in the Fourth Gospel, a narrative where the humanity of Jesus often feels minimized (compared to the Synoptic

⁶³ On the use of emphatic negation as a sign of deliberative questions in Koine Greek, see Lightfoot, *Natural Logic and the Greek Moods*, 72; McKay, *New Syntax*, 94; and Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993), 338. This question is quite interesting. The standard line in Greek grammars is that $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ combines to constitute a very strong idiom of negation; hence, 18:11b has 1 NPI and expects a positive answer. However, it may be possible to argue $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$ constitutes a very strong dual negation (2 distinct NPIs), and linguistically, the subjunctive $\pi\acute{\omega}$ constitutes the use of a deontic modal, also a NPI; hence, 18:11b has 3 NPIs and expects a (very) positive answer. See Chapter 9 for more on NPIs, as well as Han, “Interpreting Interrogatives,” 224.

⁶⁴ Contra Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 203; C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 68; Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 522; Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 3:227; and Mark W. G. Stibbe, “‘Return to Sender’: A Structuralist Approach to John’s Gospel,” in *The Interpretation of John*, 2nd ed., ed. John Ashton, Studies in New Testament Interpretation (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 267–68.

⁶⁵ Morris, *Gospel According to John*, 660.

⁶⁶ Contra Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 68. Also contra Edwin Abbott, who sees this as an exclamative; Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, 191.

Gospels), but this is one of those moments where—perhaps subdued—the humanity of the Johannine Jesus punches through.

Here's where it gets interesting: The standard line among commentators is that John's depiction of this part of the arrest sequence is at variance both in content and style from the Synoptics' version (Matt 26:36–46; Mark 14:32–42; Lk 22:39–46). Not only does John omit the prayer at Gethsemane, John rejects the Synoptics' portrayal of Jesus' deep struggle.⁶⁷ Quite the contrary—John's account substantiates the Synoptics' account.⁶⁸ What John does is omit the Gethsemane story, not by rejecting it, but by truncating it into a classical move of tragedy, the deliberative question. Jesus' deliberation over going to the cross seems limited in John only because modern readers can compare it to the longer, more drawn-out version in the Synoptics. John, in his simple, powerful prose, reduces the Synoptic experience to one question—a tragic question devised to portray the very real struggle Jesus faces. John does not omit the struggle, he refashions the struggle to fit the Johannine style. The end of dialogue and move to the mechanics of the arrest leaves the reader persuaded Jesus has deliberated his drinking of the cup, and only then would choose to follow the Father's plan to go to the cross.

⁶⁷ For examples of this view, see Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 462; and Hanson, *Prophetic Gospel*, 299.

⁶⁸ Cf. Plummer, *Gospel According to St John*, 322.

CHAPTER EIGHT

RESPONSIVE QUESTIONS

It was only a question.
—David (1 Sam 17:29)

As we progress through the different types of questions employed by the Johannine Jesus, we move from less persuasive to more persuasive use of the interrogative form. Whereas open questions generally have limited persuasive qualities, reflective questions and decisive questions have qualities that can mildly persuade audiences. In contrast, this chapter and the next consider two categories of questions with stronger persuasive qualities—or to use traditional language about questions, are much more ‘rhetorical.’ The first of these two groups is the responsive question. A *responsive question* elicits some type of reply or answer from the audience; it persuades a hearer to respond. It can be asked by the speaker for several reasons, but the most common reason is to get a definitive reply from an audience. When someone hears a responsive question, that person will be tempted to respond even if the question is directed toward someone else. This description raises a question: Aren’t almost all questions responsive questions, since almost all are seeking a response?

Let’s take a step back. The simple act of asking a question does persuade a listener to respond, at least to some degree. In infancy, children learn basic language skills that include how conversation occurs.¹ They learn that whenever a dialogue occurs, speakers must take turns for any type of language exchange to take place. One of the most fundamental patterns of

¹ Some readers may wonder whether conversational analysis is a suitable tool for better understanding speech patterns in ancient narratives. The short answer is “Yes, with caution.” Here’s why. Regardless of one’s position on the origin of the speeches in John—*imitatio*, fiction, eyewitness testimony, reliance on oral or written sources or other—any creator of narrative that includes speeches with any appreciable skill will at minimum model or mimic those speeches after conversation in natural discourse. The caution stems from our having no natural conversations in ancient Greek (whether oral or written) to use comparatively; instead we must rely on conversations from later iterations of related Indo-European languages. Thus, with caution, I believe we can conversation analysis in certain situations to better understand speech patterns in ancient narratives.

turn-taking in discourse is the question-answer pair.² Responding to questions is a learned response that occurs in infancy for humans. Whenever we hear an utterance with interrogative force, we are conditioned to want to respond.³ This elementary idea of turn-taking and question-answering occurs in narrative discourse just as it does in natural discourse, given that narrative mimics the natural. Therefore, while all questions asked *expect* a response (in some way), they do not all *persuade* listeners to give a response. For example:

- (1) What is the gram-molecular weight of iridium? (Test question)

When a speaker (probably a teacher) asks this question, it would be hard on any listener to let the question hang in mid-air, unanswered, even if the exact answer is unknown. In fact it is often uncomfortable for a question to be asked and then silence to occur—someone will want to speak up because they were programmed at infancy that answering is the ‘completion’ of a question. This is the natural, learned response to question and answer pairs, but it is not a form of rhetoric and persuasion. At the same time, while many hearers of this test question will feel the subsequent silence to be uncomfortable, there is nothing in the question itself that persuades someone to respond, especially if one does not know the answer (such a difficult question may in fact *expect* an answer while at the same time *dissuade* a listener from responding!). Therefore, responsive questions differentiate themselves from other types of questions in that they are asked by a speaker to elicit a response by the manner in which they are asked—coming in turn two rather than turn one. For example:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (2) Let's go to that Asian fusion restaurant. | (Speaker 1) |
| What Asian fusion restaurant? | (Speaker 2,
Responsive question) |

or

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (3) Can we go to the Asian fusion restaurant? | (Speaker 1) |
| What Asian fusion restaurant? | (Speaker 2,
Responsive question) |

² Sarles, *Language and Human Nature*, 175; and Anna-Brita Stenström, “Questioning in Conversation,” in *Questions and Questioning*, ed. Michel Meyer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 304.

³ Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse: Philosophical Reflections on the Claim that God Speaks* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 101; Somerville, *Epistemological Significance*, 127; and Ronald T. Hyman, “Esther 3:3: The Question with No Response,” *JBQ* 22:2 (1994): 103.

Here (2) and (3) depict a two-turn conversational sequence. In the first turn, Speaker 1 makes a proposition (or question) about selecting a place for dining out. In the second turn, instead of continuing the dialogue with an expected reply (“Great idea, I really love that Asian fusion restaurant”), Speaker 2 asks a question that at first glance would appear to be a typical variable (wh-) question. However, because the speaker asks this question in turn two, the semantic and pragmatic focus of the question shifts from general information to specific response. This shift is even more pronounced when turn one is used by Speaker 1 to ask a question rather than make a statement. Unlike typical variable questions, the point of the question has shifted from “tell me the answer?” to the more forceful “answer me!”

Let’s consider the same question in two different scenarios:

(4) What Asian fusion restaurant?

If Speaker 1 asks (4) in turn one, then Speaker 1 has a desire for someone (anyone) to offer *x* (“the one in Dooradoyle” or “the one we ate at last week” or “anyone except that one on 5th Avenue”). However, if Speaker 2 asks (4) in response to Speaker 1’s proclamation in (2), Speaker 2 desires a dedicated response to the turn two question (“You know, the one on Chincoteague”). If Speaker 2 asks (4) in response to Speaker 1’s question in (3), then Speaker 2 wants a clear response as well. The difference between Speaker 2’s response to Speaker 1 in (2) and Speaker 1 in (3) is that a question in response to a question instead of a statement typically puts greater interrogative pressure on the original speaker. When a question occurs in turn two it likely will have a responsive quality, but not always. All of the responsive questions Jesus asks in John are turn two questions.

Responsive questions do not possess their persuasive power due to syntax but due to a combination of semantics and pragmatics. Much of Western expectations about discourse and conversation originate with the works of Plato, wherein he presents Socrates’ articulation of an ideal dialogue—an ideal still treasured today in Western languages.⁴ Because responsive questions grate against this ideal dialogue, they not only secure responses but also are very useful in persuading unwilling hearers to respond. Responsive questions can trick a hearer into revealing too much or raising the intensity of a conversation. Of the different types of responsive questions, there are at least three used by Jesus in the Fourth

⁴ Wang, “Questions,” 533.

Gospel: *opposing-turn questions*, *retort questions* and *echo questions*. These types of responsive questions rely heavily on the pragmatics of specific contexts to persuade listeners, something that emerges even in an ancient narrative like the Fourth Gospel. The questions of Jesus in John with a strongly responsive quality include John 2:4, 3:10, 11:9a and 13:38.

Opposing-Turn Questions

An *opposing-turn question* is a question in which the asker asks a question in response to a question raised by the previous speaker.⁵ As a result of the norms of human language, turn-taking in dialogue will tend to follow certain pre-established procedures or patterns (as we discussed above), although a speaker may (and does) frequently violate these patterns.⁶ Opposing-turn questions occur when in turn one, a speaker asks a question, and then in turn two, a different speaker responds with a question rather than an answer (proposition). An opposing-turn question is received by an audience as a turn-taking violation. This violation persuades the hearer to respond. For example:

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| (5) Are you going to change the baby's diaper? | (Speaker 1, Turn 1) |
| Why are you asking me that? | (Speaker 2, Turn 2) |

In (5), Speaker 1 appears to ask a reasonable question (polar with mild bias). Hearers will expect an answer of a certain type due to their understanding of this language game.⁷ With the mild bias, most hearers will expect an affirmative reply ("Yes" or "Sure, no problem"), though a hearer would deem a negative reply as reasonable ("No" or "I was going to let you do it").⁸ There are other affirmative or negative options. In contrast, by asking a question in turn two, Speaker 2 breaches turn protocol and the

⁵ Eroteticians divide opposing-turn questions into several different sub-categories, but I will treat all opposing-turn questions together throughout this book for the sake of consistency; see Gruber, "Questions and Strategic Orientation," 1829–41.

⁶ See for example, Leonardi and Santambrogio, "Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers," 451.

⁷ And the power of the interrogative to control dialogue in a way declaratives do not and cannot; see for example, Harvey Sacks, *Lectures on Conversation*, ed. Gail Jefferson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 49–55; and Liddicoat, *Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, 74.

⁸ These examples, as with all of the examples in this book, assume a 'normal' pragmatic context. In this example, it would be much more confrontational to hear a negative answer with exclamatory force than an opposing-turn question asked sheepishly. This goes back to my earlier agreement with speech-act theorists and conversational analysts that pragmatics can override almost everything in language.

question is not resolved. This creates an uncertainty for Speaker 1 (or any other speaker) for turn three.

Not all questions asked in turn two are automatically opposing-turn questions. To be an opposing-turn question, there must be some semantic relationship between the utterances of turn one and turn two. For example:

- (6) Are you going to change the baby's diaper?
 What is a Higgs boson? (Nonsensical question)

In (6), Speaker 2 does employ a question in turn two, but it is not an opposing-turn question because the second question does not relate in any way to the conversation at hand.⁹

While opposing-turn questions are semantically linked with their turn one utterance, opposing-turn questions are not naturally arising.¹⁰ Opposing-turn questions are intentional acts, and most often pre-meditated. For example:

- (7) What is that?
 What is what? (Repair question)

The question in turn two in (7) is not an opposing-turn question. It is an echo question functioning as a repair question due to a missed indexical in turn one, as it arises naturally from the conversation and is not pre-meditated. Opposing-turn questions cannot be repair questions as they have contrasting effects on discourse.

In general, turn-two utterances are highly strategic as they often set the tone and direction of the dialogue more so than turn-one utterances. Thus, there is a great deal of strategic value in speaking second rather than first.¹¹ In turn two, the second speaker—based upon what the first speaker reveals in turn one—may go on the offense, play defense, or do neither and punt it away.¹² Opposing-turn questions push against the speaker in turn one and stress the need for a response.¹³ They are challenges that will

⁹ In this instance, the second question could be a focus-shifting question, but more than likely it is a just a nonsensical question.

¹⁰ See for example, Charles E. Caton, "Essentially Arising Questions and the Ontology of a Natural Language," *Noûs* 5:1 (1971): 27–37.

¹¹ Gruber, "Questions and Strategic Orientation," 1840.

¹² Ian Hutchby, "Power in Discourse: The Case of Arguments on a British Talk Radio Show," *Discourse and Society* 7:4 (1996): 488.

¹³ Stein, *Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings*, 23.

provoke some degree of confrontation.¹⁴ As a type of attack, opposing-turn questions are sometimes assertions masquerading as questions.¹⁵ At the same time, conversation analysts consider opposing-turn questions to be “weak face-threatening devices” because they usually are confrontational without engendering total dialogue breakdown.¹⁶ In other words, they bend—not break—the dialogue. Even so, opposing-turn questions raise intensity within the dialogue and can border on the exclamatory. Speakers can use them as a gambit in an argument or as a trap for Speaker 1.¹⁷ In narrative, when a reader witnesses the use of an opposing-turn question, their natural predilection is to object to the opposing-turn question since it violates their expectations for turn two. This objection causes them to want to respond to Speaker 2—not Speaker 1—in order to raise their concerns and respond to the question on behalf of Speaker 1. In many cases, though, this is exactly the response desired by the narrator, who sets up and employs opposing-turn questions (especially from the protagonist) to inspire the reader to respond to the questions raised. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus uses opposing-turn questions on several occasions including John 3:10 and 6:61.

Case Study: John 3:10

⁹ Νικόδημος: πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι

¹⁰ Ἰησοῦς: σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις

⁹ Nicodemus: How is it possible for these things to be?

¹⁰ Jesus: You are the teacher of Israel and you don't understand these things?

Nicodemus, a member of the Judean ruling council, came to Jesus by night to speak to him. Nicodemus knows Jesus must be a teacher who has come from God because no one could perform the miraculous signs Jesus did without being from God (3:1–2). Jesus tells him the truth about being born again—from above—but this idea is lost on Nicodemus (3:3–4). Jesus tries again; he patiently explains to Nicodemus that to enter the Kingdom of God requires a birth by water and a birth by Spirit (3:5). He also tells Nicodemus that he should not be surprised by this, and uses a play on

¹⁴ Simpson, *Language through Literature*, 146.

¹⁵ For example, de Man, *Allegories of Reading*, 9.

¹⁶ Gruber, “Questions and Strategic Orientation,” 1816.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1824.

words to describe the movement of God as something unseen but very much felt and experienced (3:7–8). Nicodemus, unsatisfied, wants more details and a better answer, saying: “How is it possible for these things to be?” To this, Jesus bluntly responds: “You are the teacher of Israel and you don’t understand these things?” (3:10).

The erotetic logic of John 3:10 is much more complex than any reader or linguist would prefer.¹⁸ Unlike most of the other questions of Jesus in John, we cannot nail down what John meant with a high degree of precision—but we can eliminate common misconceptions about Jesus’ utterance. Approaching the question, there are a number of factors we must consider. First, Jesus forms the question as a polar question.¹⁹ Second, the question is conjunctive. Third, the first half of the question carries a positive polarity and the second half carries a negative polarity. Fourth, the question includes a strong indexical, ταῦτα. Fifth, and most importantly, Jesus’ question comes in turn two after a previous question, marking it as an opposing-turn question. If Jesus had asked his question (an opposing-turn conjunctive positive/negative polar question with indexical) in most modern, Western languages, it would be decipherable, but the same is not true in Koine Greek.

The root of the problem is that the question is polar conjunctive and in Greek.²⁰ This logically presents us with three major options for handling the interrogative force of the question (and a hundred more once we factor in emphasis):²¹

- (8) Are you the teacher of Israel? *and* You don’t understand these things?
- (9) You are the teacher of Israel. *and* You don’t understand these things?
- (10) Are you the teacher of Israel? *and* You don’t understand these things.

Unfortunately, all three of these readings—(8), (9) and (10)—are logically sound. Fortunately, there is one small clue that may help: There is the negative polar item οὐ in the second clause of Jesus’ question.²² Since negative polar items introduce a great deal of interrogative force bias into

¹⁸ I say this in relation to the simple types of questions used in most all modern erotetic studies; plus a note on the complexity, see Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 4.

¹⁹ Based upon syntax, it is possible to read 3:10 as a proposition. I believe the semantic and contextual evidence points to the utterance’s primary force as interrogative. It may also contain some exclamative force as well.

²⁰ Cf. Pratarelli and Lawson, “Conjunctive Forms and Conditional Inference,” 415.

²¹ Readers may wonder why there are only three options; technically, there are four but the fourth is equivalent to a declarative sentence. Hence I excluded it above.

²² See below for an extended discussion of negative polar items.

the question, it is less likely to read the first clause as a question and the second clause as a declarative.²³ This also means that the primary focus of the sentence is on the second clause (understanding) rather than the first clause (Nicodemus' identity).²⁴ This has serious repercussions for critics' handling of the questions in 3:9–10.

In order to understand Jesus' question in 3:10, we need to step back and start with Nicodemus' preceding question. Nicodemus asks Jesus, "How is it possible for these things to be?" Readers sometimes see Nicodemus' question as one asked out of ignorance. Unfortunately, this does not seem to agree exactly with the interrogative force of the question. When Nicodemus asks, "πῶς," it signals to the reader that an open question is coming. Looking more closely, context (reaction to a monologue) and semantics (δύναται and γενέσθαι) reveal there is at minimum a mild rhetorical quality within Nicodemus' question. Therefore, it appears more likely Nicodemus means his question with strong informational quality and mild rhetorical quality; it is probably a weak sequence question. Nicodemus is not asking "I don't understand, can you explain it again?" as much as he is asking "I don't understand, can you explain it more?" The primary goal of Nicodemus' question is to persuade Jesus to provide more details (not a simple reply, but a carefully-reflected answer). This Jesus does (3:11–21), but not at first.²⁵

Given the complexity of Jesus' question, we could study it in the light of any of the multiple rhetorical qualities it possesses—but its use as an opposing-turn question is the most significant.²⁶ When Nicodemus asks Jesus, "How is it possible for these things to be?" Jesus does not give the answer Nicodemus asks for. Instead, Jesus asks a question back to Nicodemus. Modern commentators typically see Jesus' question as a rebuke. While it is to some degree rebuking, it is not a declarative—it is a

²³ Barclay Newman and Eugene Nida feel confident the first clause is declarative (although they give no reason); see Newman and Nida, *Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*, 82.

²⁴ The first clause of 3:10 is likely a preface, or a clause that conditions the question; for examples, see Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 218; and cf. Sinclair, *Trust the Text*, 109.

²⁵ Peter Ellis labels 3:10 the "turning point" and "hinge" of the whole discourse; see Peter F. Ellis, *The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1984), 54; for a similar argument, Lincoln, *Truth on Trial*, 67.

²⁶ Many modern scholars point out the different possible emphases in the question, such as σὺ and/or ὁ, but—while true—these emphases affect the force of the question less than the primary, contextualized interrogative force does. Therefore, I omit these secondary issues just to keep the case study concise.

question—and rebuking is not the primary force of the question.²⁷ Even with all the extra qualities embedded, Jesus asks his question as a classic opposing-turn question: To confront Nicodemus in order to persuade him to turn on his brain.²⁸ Jesus intentionally raises the intensity of the conversation, hoping to push Nicodemus into responding, so as to get him to start thinking—to wake up and smell the coffee brewing.²⁹ Jesus' question is provocative, but not purposely offensive. It is also ironic primarily due to its interrogative force: Jesus asks a famed teacher to put his thinking cap on.³⁰ For readers of the Fourth Gospel, the question is equally provocative, pushing them to think and respond as to whether or not they understand.

Echo Questions

Echo questions are questions wherein what is asked is in some way an echo of a prior utterance. The echo contained in the question can either be simply a paraphrase or an exact repetition of the words from the previous utterance.³¹ Like opposing-turn questions, echo questions can only occur in the second (or later) discourse turn. In modern erotetics, there

²⁷ Augustine, *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 12.6; and contra, for example, Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 1:375; Haenchen, *John*, 1:202; Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, 1:117; Robert Kysar, "The Making of Metaphor: Another Reading of John 3:1–15," in *"What is John?": Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia, SBL-SymS 3 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 27; and Buch-Hansen, "It is the Spirit that Gives Life," 314.

²⁸ Cf. Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:129; Westcott, *Gospel According to St John*, 52; and Stein, *Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings*, 23.

²⁹ Contra Godfrey Nicholson, who mistakenly claims Jesus is dismissing Nicodemus; see Nicholson, *Death as Departure*, 77; and contra Rudolf Bultmann, who believes there was no way possible for Nicodemus to have known any of this; see Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 144.

³⁰ Many readers accurately note the question is ironic, but mistakenly try to explain it solely via semantic reasons (for example, Paul Duke's declarative example from Plato's *Protagoras*). The semantics are integral pieces but they are amplified via the interrogative force, which is what 'makes' the question particularly ironic; for examples, see Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 46, 164; Félix Moser, "Mißverständnis und Ironie in der johanneischen Argumentation und ihr Gebrauch in der heutigen pfarramtlichen Praxis," in *Johannes-Studien: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum Johannes-Evangelium*, ed. Martin Rose (Zurich: Theologischer, 1991), 53; Klaus Scholtissek, "Ironie und Rollenwechsel im Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 89:3–4 (1998): 240, 253; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 366; and R. Alan Culpepper, "Reading Johannine Irony," in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 195.

³¹ Noh, *Metarepresentation*, 152; and A. M. Devine and Laurence D. Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 3.

is some debate as to whether or not echo questions are truly questions,³² and whether or not they are a special class of utterances without interrogative force.³³ Since much of this debate centers on particulars of English-language interrogatives,³⁴ and is less of an issue with questions in natural discourse, we will treat echo questions as real interrogatives that are highly persuasive in narrative situations such as the Fourth Gospel. While there are a number of different types of echo questions, the two types I will mention here are the most common: *extra variable echo questions* and *repeating echo questions*. For example:

- | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (11) | I want to live in Girdletree. | (Speaker 1) |
| | You want to live where? | (Speaker 2, Echo question) |
| (12) | I'm going to the beach. | (Speaker 1) |
| | You're going to the beach? | (Speaker 2, Echo question) |

In (11), Speaker 2 responds to the statement of Speaker 1 in the second discourse turn with an echo question. Here the word 'where' introduces an interrogative force to echo the idea from the previous utterance.³⁵ While 'where' is an interrogative pronoun typically suggestive of variable questions, it does not seek *x* in the manner of an open question—rather it alludes to an idea in the previous statement (in this case, 'Girdletree').³⁶ In (12), Speaker 2 alters the earlier statement to restate it in turn two as an echo question.³⁷ We also note from (11) that extra variable echo questions can also be repetitive (in this case, repeating the words 'want to live').

Not all questions that follow-up previous statements are echo questions; in fact, most are not.³⁸ For example:

³² For examples of those who argue echo questions are interrogatives, see Noh, *Metarepresentation*, 158; and Seizi Iwata, "Echo Questions Are Interrogatives? Another Version of a Metarepresentational Analysis," *LP* 26:2 (2003): 248.

³³ For examples of those who argue echo questions lack interrogative force, see David Adger, *Core Syntax: A Minimalist Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 352.

³⁴ Cf. Dik, *Word Order*, 136–37.

³⁵ Notice that in English, the *wh*-interrogative pronoun 'where' comes at the end of the sentence (*in-situ*) and does not move to the beginning of the sentence (fronts). Likewise, echo questions based on polar syntax do not invert subject and verb as is customary in English. These syntactical anomalies in English are a leading cause for the idea that echo questions are not real questions; see Nicholas Sobin, "Echo Questions in the Minimalist Program," *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:1 (2010): 132–34.

³⁶ Thus, extra variable echo questions and indexical questions may look very similar syntactically, and can be very similar in usage. The only way to distinguish these two types is via semantics, pragmatics and/or the context of the question in natural discourse.

³⁷ To be more precise, this question is actually a polar, declarative, echo question; we treat it here primarily as an echo question because that is its most notable quality.

³⁸ For example, see Noh, *Metarepresentation*, 166.

- (13) I'm going to the beach.
 What beach are you going to? (Variable question, Turn 2)

(13) is not an echo question—it is just a typical variable question with mild repair quality. The variable question employed by the second speaker in this example simply continues the conversation, asking for information from Speaker 1. Echo questions represent a very specific pattern of syntax and semantics that differ from language to language.

Echo questions are highly persuasive in eliciting responses from hearers. A speaker will ask an echo question to persuade the previous speaker to respond and explain the previous utterance that prompted the echo question. They tend to be more unidirectional than omnidirectional, and are especially persuasive to the speaker of the previous utterance. An asker may use echo questions with mild force to repair a conversation or clarify another speaker's point.³⁹ In contrast, an asker may use strong-force echo questions to apply a great deal of interrogative pressure to the audience to ensure a response (though the more pressure, the less pleasant the response). They may possess an exclamatory quality in order to register surprise or anger.⁴⁰ All things being equal, repeating echo questions generally have a stronger persuasive quality than extra variable echo questions for two reasons: they are usually polar questions and they are highly repetitive. The greater the degree of repetition, the greater the interrogative pressure on the hearer.⁴¹ In the Gospel of John, Jesus asks only one obvious echo question, John 13:38.

Case Study: John 13:38

- ³⁷ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· . . . τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω
³⁸ ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις

- ³⁷ Peter said to him . . . I will lay down my life for you.
³⁸ Jesus answered, You will lay down your life for me?

At the evening meal before the Passover Feast, Jesus knows his departure from this world is imminent (13:1). During the supper, Jesus gets up from his meal and begins to wash the feet of the disciples (13:2–16). In the discussion that ensues, Jesus becomes troubled and reveals to his disciples

³⁹ Jerrold M. Sadock, "Hypersentences" (PhD diss., University of Illinois, 1969), 91; and Noh, *Metarepresentation*, 152.

⁴⁰ Brown, Joseph, and Wallace, "Questions and Answers," 1:493; and Sadock, "Hypersentences," 91.

⁴¹ Cf. Baxter, Boon, and Marley, "Interrogative Pressure," 89.

that one of them will betray him (13:18–21). Peter encourages one of the other disciples, the one that Jesus loves, to ask Jesus who will betray him (13:23–25). Jesus tells the disciple he will indicate who it is with the gift of a sop of bread—and gives the gift to Judas (13:26–28). Jesus tells Judas to do quickly whatever he is going to do, and Judas leaves the supper. The narrator, to shift the scene, tells the reader it is night (13:27–30). Jesus begins to speak of his coming glorification; but Peter, confused, asks Jesus where he is going (13:31–36). Jesus tells Peter he cannot follow now, but he will follow soon enough (13:36). Peter, still not understanding, states that he is willing to follow even if it means laying down his life for Jesus (13:37). Jesus, turning Peter's words around on him, asks: "Will you lay down your life for me?"

Jesus' question to Peter in John 13:38 is strongly indicative of his persuasive goals. Looking at the utterance, the reader is immediately struck by Jesus' use of Peter's declaration, turning it around, and returning it as an interrogative. Because this happens in turn-two of the conversation, the question functions as an opposing-turn question. But because Jesus opposes Peter with his very own words, we realize the question is a more uncommon type, the echo question. Since Jesus forms the question as a polar question, the issue arises as to whether this utterance should be read more with interrogative force or exclamative force.⁴² Since force is not quantifiable as an either-or, I believe it is a question but does have some exclamative force (a common quality in echo questions). Therefore, this question has a strong rhetorical quality and minimal informational quality. Based on a polar form, it is challenging Peter to decide whether or not his declaration is true, but more specifically, as a repeating echo question, it is pushing Peter to respond.⁴³ The narrator gives no indication if Peter tried to respond, but when someone poses a repeating echo question to someone else in natural discourse, the most common reaction is an "objection," a response to the earlier question.

⁴² Von Speyr renders it as a declarative; Adrienne von Speyr, *The Farewell Discourses: Meditations on John 13–17*, trans. E. A. Nelson (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1987), 73; but against this, Paul Duke feels certain it is a question; see Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 49.

⁴³ On the challenging aspect, cf. Michael Labahn, "Peter's Rehabilitation (John 21:15–19) and the Adoption of Sinners: Remembering Jesus and Relecturing John," in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, SBLECL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 343.

There are additional overtones to Jesus' question in John 13:38. Anytime a speaker asks an echo question in a narrative text, it reads as ironic.⁴⁴ This leads to the classic, dual interpretation of the question: The question either affirms or mocks Peter.⁴⁵ Neither of these readings is accurate; both push the intent of the question so far as to make it little more than an assertion on the extreme fringe of its interpretive edge. Instead, if we can accurately appreciate the interrogative force of the question, with its subtle irony, we can see the question in a more natural light. When Jesus uses an echo question, his primary purpose is to engage Peter's argument on a very literal level. To hear one's own words repeated back to oneself—regardless of force—triggers a very natural desire to respond, clarify, or reiterate. Jesus' use of an echo question is not to assert anything to Peter, but to ask him if this is really what is going to happen. Jesus, in effect, asks Peter to prove his statement.⁴⁶ Jesus' use of this type of question demonstrates his investment in Peter, but he wants to know the truth of his commitment level.⁴⁷ Hearing the repeated challenges of Jesus increasingly pushes the reader to decide and respond.

Retort Questions

Retort questions are questions that employ unrelated, proverbial language as a response to a previous question in order to be sarcastic. They are an extremely rare form of interrogative. Retort questions are not information seeking questions; they act as thinly-veiled assertions couched in interrogative force.⁴⁸ Retort questions are often called *sarcastic interrogatives*,

⁴⁴ Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 90–91, 97; Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 486; and McCaffrey, *House with Many Rooms*, 150–51.

⁴⁵ For an early example of this, see the comments of the Venerable Bede (673–735), cited in Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels Collected out of the Works of the Fathers*, trans. John Henry Newman (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845), 4:446. For an example of affirmation, see Westcott, *Gospel According to St John*, 199; and for an example of mockery, see Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 478.

⁴⁶ Cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 424; and Ellis, *Genius of John*, 219.

⁴⁷ Contra J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, HaNTC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988), 318.

⁴⁸ Modern eroteticians tend to reject the 'question' label for speech acts like retort questions, preferring to label them as 'non-question interrogatives' instead. This means retort questions are utterances with interrogative force that do not actually ask anything (non-question). The problem with this view is that it overly limiting. While the primary purpose of retort questions is not information-seeking, speakers do use them to 'raise an issue' that expects a (non-literal) response in natural discourse.

pointed rhetorical questions, or a variety of other names.⁴⁹ They are a special type of opposing-turn question. Since retort questions perform a unique linguistic function, there are very narrow criteria for their identification: Retort questions must be polar questions that a speaker asks (in turn two) as a response to a polar question (asked in turn one); they must be unrelated to the discussion at hand in content; and they must be proverbial or folksy in feel so as to ridicule the turn-one question.⁵⁰ As with other turn-two questions, retort questions are only detectable as such in narrative dialogue. Positive identification of retort questions requires evidence from syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Speakers use retort questions in natural discourse as a sarcastic response mechanism to make a point about a previous utterance. For example:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (14) Do you want to go to the beach? | (Speaker 1) |
| Do bees have knees? | (Speaker 2, Retort question) |
| (15) Can I borrow your computer? | (Speaker 1) |
| Is the Pope Catholic? | (Speaker 2, Retort question) |

In both (14) and (15), the speaker uses the first turn to ask a polar question (to persuade the recipient of the question to decide “yes” or “no”). Instead of answering the question—the expected move—the recipient (Speaker 2) selects a retort question to oppose Speaker 1’s original question. Neither retort question is related in content to the original question; thus, it ridicules the first speaker’s question. Not all questions that are sarcastic and opposing-turn are necessarily retort questions. For example:

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| (16) Which state has the best weather? | (Speaker 1) |
| Minnesota? | (Speaker 2) |

In (16), Speaker 2 does respond to Speaker 1 sarcastically and interrogatively, but Speaker 2’s question is an opposing-turn question rather than a retort question for two reasons. First, the original question (asked in turn one) is not a polar question; and second, the opposing question is not proverbial in meaning. Thus, this example does not qualify as a retort question.

Retort questions are an extreme form of question, and probably have the lowest degree of interrogative force of any question we consider in this

⁴⁹ Charles Doyle lists more than seventeen different terms coined in modern research to describe these unique speech acts; see Charles Clay Doyle, “Is the Pope Still Catholic? Historical Observations on Sarcastic Interrogatives,” *Western Folklore* 67:1 (2008): 9.

⁵⁰ Doyle, “Is the Pope Still Catholic?” 5–33.

study. If a speaker uses a retort question with mild rhetorical force, they come off at best as light-hearted and at worst as impatient. With strong rhetorical force, retort questions are pushy, stinging, and often combative. Their nature renders them grating to an audience if used with any frequency. Retort questions are an exceedingly rare form of interrogative, and extreme caution must be taken to positively identify them in narrative. Jesus only uses a retort question once in the Fourth Gospel, John 11:9, although the question is more likely something of a hybrid, given Jesus' usage of the question as a tie in to his parable (John 11:9–10).

Case Study: John 11:9a

οὐχὶ δώδεκα ὥραι εἰσιν τῆς ἡμέρας

Aren't there twelve hours in the day?

The narrator reveals that Lazarus is sick, and includes some brief circumstances of the sickness (11:1–3). Mary, sister of Lazarus, sends word to Jesus of the sickness, but Jesus decides to remain where he is even though the narrator cues the reader in to the fact that Lazarus is not an unknown person but someone who Jesus loves (11:3–6). Two days after receiving the news, Jesus announces his intent to return to Judea, even though his disciples question the wisdom of this journey, noting that the Judean leaders tried to kill Jesus only a short time prior (11:6–8). With the emotional timbre of the scene set by the sickness and potential death of Lazarus, Jesus responds to the disciples' question with a question of his own (11:9a), and then launches into a short parable (11:9–10) built off of the retort question in John 11:9a. The twist for the reader is that while the disciples' question is a very natural and earnest question in the narrative, Jesus' question in response to the disciples seems odd and is completely unrelated.

It is no surprise that the question in John 11:9a has proved puzzling to so many interpreters over the years. Some have tried to allegorize it, some have tried to transmute it into a parabolic proposition, and some have tried to identify it as a floating saying clumsily inserted into the text—but none of these approaches take the interrogative seriously. We recognize immediately from the syntax that John 11:9a is a negative polar question, so we expect it to have a strong rhetorical quality. Especially with the potentially emphatic οὐχὶ.⁵¹ It may or may not have a noticeable informational quality. Our first inclination is that Jesus wants to strongly

⁵¹ Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1:665.

push a confirmation of sorts back on the disciples. Not stopping here, the question Jesus asks serves as a turn-two response to the disciples' question, giving us some sort of opposing-turn question. This also makes sense because Jesus clearly pushes back against the disciples' probable intent with their question-asking. The real clue, however, is the fact that Jesus' question does not semantically relate to the disciples' questions in any way. The disciples ask a polar question (with bias) in an attempt to at least confirm whether or not Jesus will return to Judea. Jesus' question speaks of hours in a day. It uses proverbial language.⁵² The whole point of the question Jesus asks in response to the disciples is to chide them for trying to discourage him from going to see Lazarus, whom he loved. If reworded into colloquial English today, their conversation would perhaps go something like this:

Disciples: "Rabbi, a few weeks ago the Judean leaders tried to kill you, you sure you want to go back there?"

Jesus: "Aren't there 24 hours in a day? Look, if someone walks . . ."

John 11:9a fits all of the criteria to be a retort question.⁵³ But is it? The glaring concern is that retort questions are so very rare in natural discourse, and even more so in written discourse.⁵⁴ One seeming weakness to this argument is John 11:9b–10. In normal circumstances, a speaker can follow up a retort question in a couple of different ways, but seguing into a mini-parable is not typically one of them. The presence of 11:9b–10 may make for an interesting case study for linguistics, logicians and folklorists, but does not present a major problem in Jesus' use of a retort question. There are two very plausible explanations: Either John's Jesus took a proverbial expression as a retort question, and then riffed off of it into a parable, or a

⁵² Collins, *These Things Have Been Written*, 147; and Gangel, *John*, 214.

⁵³ For one list of criteria, see Doyle, "Is the Pope Still Catholic?" 5–33.

⁵⁴ There is a further historical footnote of evidence that this is, in fact, a retort question. In the 16th century, John Calvin wrote cryptically that he had to explain what the question could have meant proverbially because "it has passed into a common proverb." Presumably, Jesus' question came into use as a folk saying some time prior to Calvin's lifetime. The fact that it could do this is notable evidence of its original purpose and intent. It's the same principle that in the early English adaption *The Bugbears* (mid-16th century), the retort question, "Can I forsake her? Can the fyshe live on land? Can men live without breathe? Can the heavens rolling stand?" is a turn of phrase we still 'get' today. See Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, 1:428; Doyle, "Is the Pope Still Catholic?" 18; and R. Warwick Bond, ed., *Early Plays from the Italian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 103, respectively. For a related example of a universal folklore device also appearing in John, see Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, xvi, 67.

little less likely, Jesus had a parabolic idea in mind and coins a retort question off of it.⁵⁵ Depending on the way the saying evolved, it is hard for us to know for certain whether Jesus' sarcasm was more jocular or more biting. Either way, John 11:9a is a matchless literary gem that, if understood by modern readers, would be treasured as something out of Shakespeare or Hemingway. As Jesus takes a retort question and spins it into a parable without missing a step, John reveals Jesus as nothing short of a master at the rhetorical game.

⁵⁵ This should not come as a surprise; natural language evolves constantly, even in the ancient world, and this evolution includes the constant churning of slang and folksy phrases.

CHAPTER NINE

COERCIVE QUESTIONS

Sometimes the questions are complicated and the answers are simple.
—Dr. Seuss

Coercive questions represent the category of the most persuasive of all types of questions found in the Gospel of John. In legal contexts, some types of coercive questions are called *leading questions* in that they attempt to lead a hearer to a pre-determined answer. Coercive questions are asked by speakers in such a way as to push listeners to agree with the speaker—far more than just to answer a question. In contrast to most other types of questions, coercive questions are especially common in arguments, discussions and disputations because of their great rhetorical and persuasive power. Open questions may start a debate, but coercive questions win debates.¹ As a result, coercive questions must use very specific combinations of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors to achieve their persuasive results. For example:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| (1) Will you trust in Jesus? | (Decisive question) |
| (2) Won't you trust in Jesus? | (Coercive question) |

Notice the only difference between (1) and (2) is a minor syntactical switch from positive polarity in the first example to negative polarity in the second example. Yet the small syntactic change belies the change in semantic and pragmatic persuasive power.² The question in (1) encourages the audience to decide, but the question in (2) subtly pushes any hearer to say 'yes' (or resent the question if the push is detected). It is this push—sometimes subtle, sometimes not—that makes these types of questions coercive.

¹ A prominent example of this occurs in legal venues, where lawyers who are sympathetic to a witness ask primarily open questions (to establish facts), and lawyers who are opposed to a witness ask primarily coercive questions (especially biased questions, to push the witness); see for example, Malcolm Coulthard and Alison Johnson, *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence* (London: Routledge, 2007), 102–107.

² Floricic, "Negation and 'Focus Clash,'" 130.

Due to the unique nature of language, a speaker can quickly ratchet up the interrogative pressure placed on listeners with stronger and stronger coercive qualities embedded in the questions. For example:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| (3) Won't you trust in Jesus? | (Coercive question) |
| (4) Won't you just trust in Jesus? | (More coercive question) |
| (5) Isn't there any way for you to
just trust in Jesus? | (Very coercive question) |
| (6) How can you not trust in Jesus? | (Very coercive question) |
| (7) You will trust in Jesus, won't you? | (Super coercive question) |

In these examples, the speaker uses several seemingly minor but really very effective rhetorical techniques to persuade and coerce hearers to agree with the speaker. In (3), the negative pushes listeners to respond in an affirmative manner, but not as much as the negative plus a bias word does in (4). By (5), any listener listening begins to feel a certain amount of interrogative pressure. (6) ups the ante further, introducing yet another, even stronger bias word. The question in (7) is arguably the most coercive of all question types, exerting a great deal of interrogative pressure on anyone in the audience.³ In many situations, (7) would come close to being heard as a threat, and would more than likely have the effect of strongly persuading some and strongly dissuading others in the audience.⁴ As a result, coercive questions can have the force of assertions, usually proposing the opposite of the literal meaning of the question.

Coercive questions also have a darker side: They are a regular staple of all sorts of unscrupulous and ruthless language. They may display a high degree of interrogative bias, and they often do not fight fair. They exemplify power imbalance in natural discourse, and an asker can use them to assert control or bring an accusation against listeners.⁵ Care must be taken when using coercive questions types—if they are not formed properly, they can easily backfire on the asker.⁶ Questions with a high degree of

³ The fourth question is a negative *tag question* (sometimes called a *rhetorical agreement question*); for a sample study of its coercive power, see Michael E. Enzle and Michael D. Harvey, "Rhetorical Requests for Help," *SPQ* 45:3 (1982): 174–75.

⁴ See for example, Blankenship and Craig, "Rhetorical Question Use and Resistance to Persuasion," 123.

⁵ Dawn Elizabeth Archer, "Verbal Aggression and Impoliteness: Related or Synonymous?" in *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, Language, Power and Social Process 21 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008), 194.

⁶ Fahnestock and Secor, *Rhetoric of Argument*, 344.

coercive quality possess a very low (or no) interest in seeking information; they are often strongly rhetorical in quality.⁷ They tend to be very effective at putting pressure on an audience.⁸ To be most effective, coercive questions are short and to the point.⁹ Within natural discourse, they usually push for the “maximally argumentative interpretation.”¹⁰ Coercive questions coming from the lips of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel include *negative polar questions*, *loaded questions* and *biased questions*. Coercive questions were part and parcel of the rhetoric of the ancient world, and if anything, modern languages such as English have continued this tradition.

Loaded Questions

A *loaded question* is a question in which the asker embeds an implicit assumption. Loaded questions have a dual effect in persuasive discourse, affecting the addressee and audience in two very different ways. For the addressee, the speaker’s purpose in asking a loaded question is to put the recipient in a double-bind, forcing a response. The assumption embedded in the loaded question is usually hostile to the addressee.¹¹ When a speaker asks a loaded question, the embedded assumption creates a dilemma for the recipient, and all energy is poured into mustering a response. Thus, the loaded question also has a leading quality with the addressee. For the audience, the speaker’s purpose in asking a loaded question is to push the audience into believing something about the addressee that usually is not accurate. Loaded questions are extremely coercive in their ability to convince an audience. For example:

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| (8) When did you stop stealing
candy from babies? | (Loaded question) |
| (9) Are all your diseases so contagious? | (Loaded question) |

⁷ Jean-Jacques Lecercle and Denise Riley, *The Force of Language*, Language, Discourse, Society (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 163.

⁸ Cf. Kraus, “From Figure to Argument,” 127.

⁹ Fahnestock and Secor, *A Rhetoric of Argument*, 343–44.

¹⁰ Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, and A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002), 43–44.

¹¹ Walton, *One-Sided Arguments*, 231; Angela Schrott, “*Que fais, Adam?* Questions and Seduction in the *Jeu d’Adam*,” in *Historical Dialogue Analysis*, ed. Andreas H. Jucker, Gerd Fritz, and Franz Lebsanft, P&BNS 66 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999), 343; and cf. Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, 17.

In (8) and (9), both questions make an assumption about the addressee that preconditions the audience and makes answering the question extremely difficult for the addressee. In (8), the asker puts the intended recipient into a no-win situation. If the addressee responds with a specific date (“Last week”), the asker proves the addressee a thief. If the addressee protests the question (“But I have never stolen candy from a baby!”), the asker succeeds in making the addressee look guilty, even if the addressee has never, ever stolen any candy. And if the addressee ducks the question, the asker still makes the addressee look guilty. With (9), the asker combines bias words (such as “so”) with a loaded question to put the addressee in an impossible situation—no matter how the addressee answers the second question, most of the audience will treat the recipient like a pariah.

Not all loaded questions need to be negative. While rare in debate, examples of positive loaded questions do pop up from time to time in natural discourse. For example:

- (10) When did you get so smart? (Loaded question)

Unless the asker directs this question to a world-renowned genius, the question in (10) embeds an assumption causing the recipient to have no choice but to respond (“Uh, I’ve always been this smart!”) and coerces listeners to believe in the great intelligence of the addressee (at least, to some degree). The result is a compliment that cannot be directly challenged.

As with other coercive questions, loaded questions are asked via context-dependent combinations of semantic and pragmatic factors.¹² In debates, a speaker usually asks a loaded question to trap the recipient and to convince the audience of the embedded assumption. Loaded questions are commonly found in legal or political contexts, or in interrogations. If detected, a loaded question can be called out or declared ‘out of bounds’ for the asker—and the asker may be labeled ‘dirty’ by the audience as a penalty.¹³ Generally speaking, conditional questions cannot be loaded questions as the very nature of the condition precludes an embedded assumption. Within the Fourth Gospel, Jesus asks two questions that act as mild loaded questions: John 1:38a and 9:35.

¹² Walton, *One-Sided Arguments*, 231.

¹³ Loaded questions are often viewed as fallacies as they typically violate rules of logic and/or formal debate forums.

Case Study: John 9:35

σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Do you believe in the Son of Man?

One day as Jesus is walking along, he and his disciples come upon a man with congenital blindness (9:1). Seeing him, his disciples ask Jesus who is to blame for the man's blindness. Jesus' reply is unexpected; he tells the disciples no one is to blame for the blindness—it occurs so the man can manifest the works of God in his life (9:3). At this, Jesus goes to the man, puts mud and spit on the man's eyes, and tells him to go rinse off in the Pool of Siloam (9:6–7). The man does just this, and finds he can see! Arriving back home, the man's newfound health causes a debate among his neighbors and friends—some believe it is the same man and others do not (9:8–12). So some of these well-meaning folks escort the man to the Pharisees in order to learn more (9:13). With a rising concern the healing took place on a Sabbath, the Pharisees interrogate the man and then his parents (9:14–34). Their interrogation is fruitless; the Pharisees do not get the answers they are looking for, and after rejecting the blind man's opinion of Jesus, they throw him out into the street (9:34). When Jesus learns the Pharisees kicked the blind man out, he goes to find him, and asks him: “Do you believe in the Son of Man?” (9:35).

What does Jesus mean by his oddly-worded question in 9:35? In light of John's narrative context, a question about faith would normally not seem exceptional. Yet there is little agreement among scholars and commentators as to the meaning and purpose of Jesus' question. The reason for this is Jesus' object of faith, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; it is a rather cryptic moniker that seems out of place. As a result, the standard approach to understanding 9:35 is to try to understand τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. However, the phrase τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a red herring cooked up by Jesus as part of his persuasive discourse. The title is of secondary importance for our understanding of what Jesus asks, and why.¹⁴

Jesus opens the dialogue with the blind man with his question, “Do you believe in the Son of Man?” It occupies turn one, a lead-off question, a good sign for the reader to wait for the other shoe to drop.¹⁵ Drop it

¹⁴ In John 9:35. My argument has nothing to do with ‘Son of Man’ research in general (a fruitful area of biblical and theological study).

¹⁵ As with other types of questions (such as expository or test) that frequent the first turn in dialogue.

does, when the reader tries to figure out the object of faith is τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. We note the question does contain an indexical in the “Son of Man” phrase, requiring listeners and reader to reference what the phrase may mean.¹⁶ And, as with many of Jesus’ questions, contextually the question does seem like some sort of test. Jesus forms the question as a polar question, with positive polarity. Our first instinct is that the question is strongly informational, with the mild rhetorical quality of asking for reflection and a decision—speakers ask positive polar questions because they want to learn of the decision made by its hearers, and the indexical demands some reflection. The question also contains the verb πιστεύω, which normally would push a question towards a speculative quality. However, in John’s narrative, πιστεύω usually indicates a more concrete “have faith in” rather than the more generic “belief” in something. This, plus the concrete object and the polar form, make it unlikely Jesus is asking a hypothetical question. To the contrary—Jesus is asking rather concretely, “Do you have faith in the Son of Man?”¹⁷ Think, decide, respond! So the primary quality of the question may turn on the phrase, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, after all.

Laying aside theological speculation, what can we say definitively about the “Son of Man” phrase? First, John uses it *thirteen* times in the Fourth Gospel. This is too much for coincidence. The phrase must not only carry some meaning, but more importantly, given John’s penchant for defining titles and places (1:38, 1:41, 1:42, 9:7, 20:16), the Fourth Evangelist must have assumed his implied reader would either get the meaning, need no assistance in understanding the meaning, or be tempted enough to go discover the meaning for themselves. Second, the phrase occurs in some capacity *a hundred and seven* times in the Old Testament. This is not an insignificant number. Turning back to the Fourth Gospel, the response of the man born blind is revealing: He does not ask for a definition of the term, but he does ask Jesus to identify the person to whom the title belongs.¹⁸ Similarly, one of the speakers in a crowd in John also does not seem put off by the phrase itself, but the speaker is confused as to what (really, who) is meant by the phrase, much like the man born blind (12:34).

¹⁶ Not only an indexical; the narrator employs it as a temporal value word; see Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 210–212.

¹⁷ Beasley-Murray, *John*, 159; and on the decisive force of the question, see D. Moody Smith, *John*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 198.

¹⁸ By the principles of erotetic logic, the man born blind must have understood Jesus’ use of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to at least a significant degree; see Kleiner, “Erotetic Logic and Scientific Inquiry,” 45.

So the primary quality of the question does turn on the phrase, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but not what the phrase means. It is what Jesus *does* with the phrase that matters. Jesus' question is a positive polar test question with an indexical, but its primary interrogative force comes as a mildly loaded question. A loaded question is an exceedingly coercive question with which an asker forces their will on the recipient of the question, and to a lesser extent, the audience. It carries an implied assumption, and it puts the recipient in a bind (for strong loaded questions, a double-bind). Here's why we know Jesus' question in John 9:35 is a mildly loaded question: The blind man cannot answer "no." We know an average Israelite in Jesus' day living in or around Jerusalem would be aware of the phrase, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; we know an average Israelite would be aware the phrase has some religious meaning.¹⁹ In this case, being 'aware' does not mean 'full understanding.'²⁰ The man born blind was simply aware of the phrase.²¹

Jesus heals the man born blind. Then the man is betrayed by his neighbors, interrogated by the Pharisees, and left to his fate by his parents. After all this, the one who heals him comes to him and asks, decisively, "Do *you* believe in the Son of Man?"²² He cannot say "no." The man born blind does not say, "no," but he does not come right out with a "yes," either. Instead, he asks Jesus a question in response to Jesus' question, "And who is he, sir?" then quickly adds, "Tell me so I can believe (Yes!)." The man's question, coming as it does in turn two as a follow-up to Jesus' question, is

¹⁹ Again, it being somewhat common in the Old Testament, it dominating the entire book of Ezekiel, its use in the Old Testament with both general and Messianic implications, its frequent use without explanation in all four canonical Gospels, and the evidence John provides by recounting two stories where there is no unusual reaction to the usage of the phrase itself.

²⁰ It is not uncommon in any era for regular folks to hear religious or philosophical terminology and not fully understand its meaning in the same way religious leaders do.

²¹ Benjamin E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2:249 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 178; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*, ed. Francis J. Moloney, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 256; Haenchen, *John*, 2:40; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 338; Philip W. Comfort and Wendell C. Hawley, *Opening the Gospel of John: A Fresh Resource for Teaching and Preaching the Fourth Gospel* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1994), 161; contra Dumm, *Mystical Portrait of Jesus*, 145; Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:253; and Burkett, *Son of Man in the Gospel of John*, 168.

²² The pronoun is likely emphatic; see for example, Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 364; Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:253; Ellis, *Genius of John*, 163; Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 347; Westcott, *Gospel According to St John*, 149; Plummer, *Gospel According to St John*, 206; and on the decisiveness of the question, Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 338.

a repair question.²³ The man asks a repair question as he wants to understand more about to what (whom) he is agreeing.²⁴

Jesus succeeds in asking the man a loaded question. The man born blind probably did not fully understand the meaning of the title. Yet Jesus puts the man in a bind to say “yes” to something he does not fully understand. The man may have been born blind, but he was not born a fool. He cannot say “no” to the man who healed him. Instead of blindly saying “yes,” he asks Jesus a repair question to make sure he understands what Jesus is asking. He doesn’t ask Jesus to define τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but to tell him who τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is. He is pushed to dig out the truth and its implications for himself. Jesus’ loaded question persuades the man born blind to reflect on and understand the indexical reference, to decide one way or the other, and to decide in Jesus’ favor so as to not appear ignorant or ungrateful.²⁵ Some modern readers may feel Jesus’ question is unfair, or that he is harsh in employing a rhetorically coercive question on a man he just healed, but loaded questions are a common feature of everyday discourse.²⁶ For the reader of the Fourth Gospel, John 9:35 is also severely persuasive: One cannot read this question without asking, “What does Jesus mean by Son of Man!?” and at the same time, feeling the need to agree, “Yes, I do believe!”

Negative Polar Questions

A *negative polar question* is a polar question with a negative polarity. In erotetics, these kinds of questions are often known as *negative polar interrogatives*. They receive their negative polarity due to the presence of a negative polar item within the sentence (such as the negative particle within a negated verb phrase).²⁷ At first blush, the difference between a

²³ A repair question is a question typically asked in a second or later turn in order to clarify an earlier utterance. Contra Sukmin Cho, who alleges the man’s question “makes no sense at all”; see Sukmin Cho, *Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel*, NTM 15 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 195–96.

²⁴ Jesus does not appear to ask a repair question in the Fourth Gospel (perhaps for obvious reasons).

²⁵ Chrysostom, *Hom. Jo.* 59.1; cf. Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 286; and Witherington, *John’s Wisdom*, 184.

²⁶ Jesus’ question is only mildly loaded, since it does not create a double-bind. Those are the types of loaded questions that give this type of question a bad reputation.

²⁷ *Negative polar items* (or NPIs, but not to be confused with *negative polar interrogatives*, also shortened to NPIs) occur in weak and strong varieties (or more, but this is well

polar question with a positive polarity and a polar question with a negative polarity would seem to be negligible. This is far from the reality.²⁸ While polar questions with a positive polarity are a decisive type of question, asking a listener to choose or confirm, negative polar questions are a much more coercive type of question. Negative polar questions do not ask an audience to decide or to confirm as much as they ask the audience to decide or confirm the speaker's point of view. Because of the negative bias in the question, a negative polar question generally persuades the audience to make a *positive* answer.²⁹ For example:

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| (11) Will you give your life to Jesus? | (Decisive question) |
| (12) Won't you give your life to Jesus? | (Coercive question) |

Anyone who hears (11) will be encouraged to respond with a decision one way or another (regardless of whether any actual response is vocal or not). Even though polar questions are not truly neutral, polar questions allow their audience some freedom to go either way for the most part ("Yes, I will," or "No, sorry, not going to"). In sharp contrast, anyone who hears (12) is unwittingly coerced by the asker into agreement ("Yes—Yes, I will!"). This is because negative polar questions imply the positive obligation.³⁰ This question suggests the speaker knows the right answer (how

beyond our scope). Negative polar interrogatives license a strong negative polar item, the negated verbal phrase.

²⁸ Brian J. Reese, "The Meaning and Use of Negative Polar Interrogatives," in *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics: Papers from CSSP 2005*, ed. Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr 6 (2006): 331–32; Robert van Rooy and Marie Šafářová, "On Polar Questions," in *Proceedings from SALT 13*, ed. Robert B. Young and Yuping Zhou (Ithaca: CLC, 2003), 292–98; and Christine Gunlogson, *True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English*, ODL (New York: Routledge, 2003), 39.

²⁹ Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 232; and Gordis, "Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences," 213. Some eroteticians argue negative polar questions can expect negative answers, and there is a great deal of debate over this, but I find this argument unconvincing; for example, Amy Tsui, "A Functional Description of Questions," in *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, ed. Malcolm Coulthard (New York: Routledge, 1992), 105; and van Rooy and Šafářová, "On Polar Questions," 293.

³⁰ Brian Reese believes negative polar questions, at their root, contain an embedded assertion pushing the rhetorical quality; if true, the 'pushiness' of negative polar questions (and other biased questions) is the result of the asker hiding a 'you do/think/be this!' declarative indirect speech act within the greater interrogative form; see Reese, "Bias in Questions," 82; or Nicholas Asher and Brian Reese, "Intonation and Discourse: Biased Questions," *ISIS* 8 (2007): 3. More general arguments on the positive obligation of negative polar questions, see Christopher Vaz, "Functional Equivalent Translation of New Testament Hortatory Discourse into Hill Madia" (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2011), 200; and Maribel Romero and Chung-hye Han, "Verum Focus in Negative Yes/No Questions and Ladd's *p* / *¬p* Ambiguity," in *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 12, ed. Brendan Jackson (Ithaca: CLC, 2002).

a hearer should respond), and its goal is to get the recipient to agree with the speaker's point of view.³¹ However, while the second question is much more persuasive, it can also be much more of a turn-off depending on the context of the question-asking. Certainly, if negative polar questions are overused (asked repetitively), hearers will perceive them as downright offensive.

Due to the slippery nature of language, not every question with a negative particle is truly a negative polar question; the negation must occur within the verbal phrase. For example:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (13) Is Bridget not in the car? | (Polar, Decisive question) |
| (14) Isn't Bridget in the car? | (NPI, Coercive question) |

Here (13) is actually a positive polar question—looking for a decision either 'yes' or 'no'—and not a negative polar interrogative.³² Using typical pragmatic force, (14) is much more rhetorical and coercive than the first due to its negation. Some suggest negative polar questions are more forceful than positive polar questions due to a truth of human nature—the innate interest in argument and debate more than peace and accord.³³

In the traditional model, negative polar questions are a frequent variation of 'rhetorical' questions.³⁴ Some languages (but not modern English or Koine Greek) even employ distinct response sets to negative polar questions to denote the semantic change.³⁵ Negative polar questions are a relatively common question type with a wide range of usage. On the weak side, an asker can use them as a means to implore a listener or audience to action, or to signal the audience about the asker's positive convictions about the issue. On the strong side, an asker can use negative polar questions as a rhetorical battering ram to bowl over an audience; thus they are a very common device in courtroom and legal situations when examination, investigation, and even excoriation of a recipient is needed. This strong use can seem 'heavy-handed' in most situations. As an

³¹ Hudson, "Meaning of Questions," 11.

³² Maribel Romero and Chung-hye Han, "On Negative Yes/No Questions," *LP* 27 (2004): 609–610; and Reese, "The Meaning and Use of Negative Polar Interrogatives," 331. Although the word 'not' in this example may still carry a bias.

³³ Gordis, "Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences," 213.

³⁴ Javier Gutiérrez Rexach, "Rhetorical Questions, Relevance and Scales," *RAEI* 11 (1998): 144, 153.

³⁵ For example, see Trine Heinemann, "Where Grammar and Interaction Meet: The Preference for Matched Polarity in Responsive Turns in Danish," in *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*, ed. Auli Hakulinen and Margret Selting, SDG 17 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005), 378.

example, narrators can use the negative effects of negative polar questions to build sympathy for protagonists verbally attacked by their antagonists. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus uses at least eleven negative polar questions—in a variety of ways and with a variety of people—but all with noticeable persuasive effect on his audience. Negative polar questions in the Fourth Gospel include John 4:35, 6:67, 6:70, 7:19a, 10:34, 11:40, 14:9a, 14:10 and 21:5.

Case Study: John 11:40

οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ

Did I not say that if you would have believed you will see the glory of God?

When Jesus arrives in Bethany, he learns Lazarus, his beloved friend, has been in the grave for four days already (11:17). Because Bethany was so close to Jerusalem, many family friends came to comfort Mary and Martha, Lazarus' sisters (11:18–19). When the sisters hear of Jesus' arrival, Martha goes to meet Jesus outside the village while Mary stays at home (11:20). Martha confronts Jesus, but Jesus explains to Martha that he is the resurrection and the life—anyone who lives and believes in him will never die (11:21–26). At this, Martha confirms her faith in Jesus and then returns to Mary to tell her to come and see Jesus also (11:27–29). Mary, accompanied by a group of mourners, goes and meets with Jesus where he is waiting outside the village (11:30–31). With tears in her eyes, she repeats the same claim Martha made: If Jesus had come before Lazarus died, he would not have died (11:32). Jesus becomes overcome by grief and begins to weep as well (11:35). Walking, they arrive at the tomb where Jesus tells the crowd to remove the stone from the entrance to the tomb (11:38–39). Martha, returning to the scene, objects to Jesus' request, citing the foul stench that would come from a decaying corpse. Without pause, Jesus asks her: "Did I not say that if you would have believed you will see the glory of God?" (11:40).

The question of Jesus in John 11:40 is devious in both its use and purpose. Among critics, it is usually given short shrift and little is said about it. Breaking down the question's interrogative force, we notice first the question is a polar question. More specifically, the presence of οὐκ renders the utterance as a negative polar question. The question also has a conditional clause embedded within it: ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. However, the fact is that the conditional clause is *not* the primary driver of the interrogative force of the question; the main clause is: οὐκ εἶπόν σοι. At its core, Jesus simply asks "Did I not say?" This confusion has

led some commentators to refer to the question as a “rebuke.”³⁶ While negative polar questions certainly can carry the rhetorical force of a rebuke, in this situation such an argument is implausible.³⁷ On context alone, Jesus—the hero—would be nothing less than a monster to rebuke a grieving sister surrounded by mourning friends while weeping at the gravesite of her beloved brother.³⁸

There are other—more persuasive—uses of negative polar questions. This type of question usually is weak in information-seeking and very strong in persuasion. As a result, we should not over-literalize Jesus’ question. When he asks, “Did I not say,” many scholars try to find a Johannine reference but this really misses the point.³⁹ Instead, Jesus uses this negative polar question to push and persuade Martha to listen to him. When Jesus asks, οὐκ εἶπὸν σοι, he pleads with her to hear what he has to say. Due to the context, we expect the pleading to be emotional, the coercion coming from the negative polar question to be heartfelt. Negative questions typically expect positive answers, but as a negative polar question, it expects a very positive reaction from its rhetorical force.⁴⁰ In this situation, not merely “Yes” to Jesus but “Yes you did!” Turning back to the conditional clause, the purpose of Jesus’ question starts to become more clear: The ἐάν πιστεύσῃς in the subjunctive sets up a possibility rather than stating a fact.⁴¹ Thus, Jesus is not expecting Martha to have believed already, he is

³⁶ See for example, Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, 1:444; Haenchen, *John*, 2:67; Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, rev. ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1950), 405; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 372; and Dunderberg, *Beloved Disciple in Conflict?*, 57.

³⁷ For example, “Didn’t I tell you to clean your room?!” but such utterances border on the exclamative or imperative as much as the interrogative.

³⁸ Andreas Köstenberger describes the question as a “gentle challenge”; see Köstenberger, *John*, 343; and cf. Timothy J. M. Ling, *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*, SNTSMS 136 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 191.

³⁹ This misses the point because the question is not literally looking for the person to answer, “Yes, you did so last week.” At least in English, the phrase “didn’t I say” carries a colloquialism rendering it less than literal in most situations (like in exasperation, I may ask someone, “Didn’t I say . . .” even if I never literally sat the person down and outlined exactly what I had wanted them to do). Even if we assume Jesus meant the question in a very literal manner, the search for a previous reference runs afoul of the way narrative works. Any narrative—from the works of Thucydides to John to Shakespeare to Tolkien—are always, by nature, tiny truncated editions of the whole story filled with an infinite number of infinitely divisible gaps. However, it is these gaps in the story that actually make the story worthwhile; see Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, 93–94, 177–178, 220–224.

⁴⁰ Zerwick and Grosvenor, *Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 307.

⁴¹ Rudolf Schnackenburg argues there is a “heavy emphasis” on the conditional clause; there is emphasis there but only because the main clause first sets up the interrogative

suggesting that if only she could believe then she would see the glory of God.⁴² Putting the question back together again, we see how interrogative force makes all the difference in determining how Jesus uses the question: To plead with Martha (and the reader) to listen—listen to what he is saying—that if only you would believe you will see the glory of God.⁴³

Jesus' question to Martha possesses an unparalleled importance for John's narrative. Almost universally, scholars point to the events of John 11 as the narrative lever that shifts Jesus from his ministry to his passion (cf. 11:45–54). If the raising of Lazarus is the lever, Jesus' question to Martha is the fulcrum. It represents one of the most powerful forms of persuasive discourse in the Fourth Gospel. The Johannine Jesus petitions a character to listen up, because if only the character would believe then that character will—without a doubt—see the glory of God. Readers of the Fourth Gospel get this. Readers of the Fourth Gospel hear Jesus implore—not rebuke—them to listen up, because if only they would believe then they will—without a doubt—see the glory of God.⁴⁴

Biased Questions

A *biased question* is a question containing one or more words or idioms of bias.⁴⁵ These types of questions “convey an expectation, or bias, on the part of the speaker toward a specific answer to the question.”⁴⁶ Biased questions are sometimes confused with loaded questions, in the sense that the bias word(s) ‘loads’ the question with a persuasive quality aimed toward the audience; however, the two types of questions are distinct. One key difference between the two is loaded questions contain words or ideas tied to the perceived addressee, whereas biased questions contain no such link to a specific individual.⁴⁷ Biases in questions originate from

force, so that when Jesus entreats Martha to listen so she can believe and will see the glory of God, the emotion swells in the asking of the question; see Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:338.

⁴² Cf. Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 328.

⁴³ Cf. Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 402.

⁴⁴ Lincoln, *Gospel According to Saint John*, 328.

⁴⁵ Technically, all questions contain some degree of bias, but many questions contain such a small degree of bias it has a negligible effect on the question. When I speak of biased questions, I mean questions with at least a noticeable degree of bias.

⁴⁶ Asher and Reese, “Intonation and Discourse,” 3.

⁴⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the difference, see Walton, *One-Sided Arguments*,

the thought-process of the asker and are often implicit but never truly unintentional. When a speaker uses a biased question, the speaker telegraphs the opinion of the issue at hand and the expectation for a correct response to the audience.⁴⁸ For example:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| (15) Are there towels? | (Decisive question) |
| (16) Are there any towels? | (Biased question) |

At first blush, (15) and (16) may seem nearly identical. When the question in (15) is asked, the listener is asked to respond, but without any clear indication of the speaker's opinion on the question. However, when the question in (16) is asked, the bias quality of 'any' reveals to the listener that the speaker a) really wants a towel and b) suspects there are no towels.⁴⁹ This kind of biased question creates tension between the asker and the hearer which may lead the hearer to go get some towels for the asker. Bias quality in questions exists in various degrees of strength; for example:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| (17) Can you open the door for me? | (Responsive question) |
| (18) Can't you open the door for me? | (Coercive question) |
| (19) Can you <i>hold</i> the door open for me? | (Biased question) |
| (20) <i>Can't</i> you <i>hold</i> the door open for me? | (Very biased question) |
| (21) <i>Can't</i> you <i>even hold</i> the door open for me? | (Super biased question) |
| (22) <i>Can't</i> you <i>even hold</i> the door open for me <i>one time</i> ? | (Ultra biased question) |

In (17), the question is a typical polar question encouraging a response ("Yes, I can" or "No, I cannot"). In (18), the negative polar question is coercive as it persuades a listener to respond positively ("Sure, I can do that"). However, since almost all polar questions betray a bias, (19), (20) and (21) use one or more bias words to not only elicit a solid response but to verbally force the listener to agree and do what is requested by the speaker. In (19), there is a slight bias built into the verb selection—'hold' implies a simple action in English compared to the slightly more complex action, 'open.'⁵⁰ Therefore, the question in (19) encourages the listener to agree with the speaker's request ("Yes, I can").⁵¹ In (20), the bias increases with the negation of the question; the speaker is in effect challenging the hearer to agree to the request ("Ok, ok, I can do it"). By (21), the bias becomes

⁴⁸ Carlson, *Dialogue Games*, 120; and Heritage and Clayman, *Talk in Action*, 136.

⁴⁹ Cf. Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 204.

⁵⁰ Cf. Minchin, "The Words of Gods," 20.

⁵¹ Cf. Litwack, "Classification of Biased Questions," 182.

very apparent as the speaker adds yet another bias word, 'even.' Bias words such as 'even,' 'any,' or 'never,' can put a very persuasive spin on questions.⁵² But such strong bias can damage the conversation. Linguistically, (21) expects a 'no' answer due to its double negation but the pragmatic intent trumps, and makes the 'question' crystal clear to the hearer: "Hold the door or else!" Thus, (21) impels the listener to agree ("Fine, you jerk, I will!") with a great deal of emotion given the semantic intensity and degree of bias inserted into the question. By (22), any listener still left is overwhelmed and probably feeling abused ("Leave me alone!"). Bias is such a powerful force in questions (more so than in propositions) that its presence can radically alter the meaning of a question.⁵³

Biased questions arm speakers with exceptional persuasive power. This power is relative to the degree of bias used, the context of the discourse, and the reception of the question by a listener.⁵⁴ Questions with weak bias can possess a predominantly informational quality, but any amount of strong bias forces the question into having a significant rhetorical quality.⁵⁵ Most Western languages not only have words but also idioms of bias to assist speakers in refocusing the persuasive force of more standard questions.⁵⁶ Questions with bias quality typically do not include questions used as invectives or curses, or questions with obscene or pejorative language (e.g., John 6:70). Bias in questions can be a sign of unfair persuasion, but not always—it is such a common occurrence in natural discourse as to be accepted in most situations, even positive ones.⁵⁷ In the Gospel of John, bias enters into questions two ways: semantically and syntactically.

⁵² Eroteticians speak of these kinds of bias words as a kind of negative polar item. As noted above, negative polar items can be weak or strong; weak NPIs (such as "any" in English) can be used in unbiased information seeking questions as well as biased questions, but strong NPIs (such as "even" in English) only appear in biased questions; see William Ladusaw, "Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations" (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1979), 186–93; Irene Heim, "A Note on Negative Polarity and Downward Entailingness," in *The Proceedings of NELS 14*, ed. Charles Jones and Peter Sells (Amherst: GLSA, 1984), 98–107; Elena Guerzoni and Yael Sharvit, "A Question of Strength: On NPIs in Interrogative Clauses," *LP 30* (2007): 362, 389; and John M. Lawler, "Any Questions?" *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (1971): 163.

⁵³ Cruse, *Lexical Semantics*, 275.

⁵⁴ Walton, *Media Argumentation*, 266; Rexach, "Rhetorical Questions, Relevance and Scales," 145; and Heinemann, "Questions of Accountability," 58.

⁵⁵ Han, "Interpreting Interrogatives," 204–205. I am unconvinced the presence of a strong bias requires the question to be wholly rhetorical; see for example, Rexach, "Rhetorical Questions, Relevance and Scales," 152–53.

⁵⁶ For example, Asher and Reese, "Intonation and Discourse," 12.

⁵⁷ Litwack, "Classification of Biased Questions," 183; and Walton, *Media Argumentation*, 265.

Semantically, Jesus employs only a mild bias in his questions on several occasions, including John 6:61 (verbal, σκανδαλίζει), 7:19c (verbal, ἀποκτείναι), 8:10b (verbal, κατακρίνω), and 8:46a (verbal, ἐλέγχει).⁵⁸ There is another very mild form of bias in the questions of Jesus that is used at least ten times in the gospel: Questions where Jesus asks if someone believes (verbal, πιστεύω). Even though this particular bias is probably very mild, the repetition of similar questions throughout the narrative builds up an influential effect that a reader of John could not ignore. Syntactically, there are only two questions with tangible bias: 8:10b (substantival, οὐδεὶς) and 21:5 (adjectival, τι).⁵⁹

Case Study: John 8:10b

οὐδεὶς σε κατέκρινεν

No one has sentenced you?

One morning, at some point in Jesus' public ministry, he enters again into the temple courts, sits down, and begins to teach as a crowd gathers (8:2). On this particular day, the Pharisees and some of the teachers of the law interrupt his teaching by escorting in a woman allegedly caught in the act of adultery. The religious leaders show off the woman before the group, and then, citing their paraphrase of the law of Moses, they ask Jesus to comment on the situation (8:3–5). So the reader doesn't miss it, the narrator reveals the purpose of the question is to trap Jesus. Instead of answering the religious leaders, Jesus ignores them, leans over and writes in the dirt with his finger (8:6). This did not stop the religious leaders from re-asking the question repeatedly.⁶⁰ After a while, Jesus stops writing, stands up, and tells them to select the one without sin to be the thrower of the first stone against this woman (8:7). He then returns to his scribbling in the dirt (8:8). One by one, the antagonists and the crowd take off, oldest (and presumably wisest) first, until only Jesus and the woman are left (8:9). So Jesus stops his scribbling, stands up and asks her: "Woman, where are they? No one has sentenced you?"

⁵⁸ As a non-native speaker of Koine Greek, it is difficult to gauge how much bias certain verbs would bring into questions. To put it another way, verbal bias is unquantifiable for modern readers because there are not one, but two, variables: semantics and pragmatics engaged in the verbal choice.

⁵⁹ In these cases, syntactically biased questions contain the negative polar items οὐδεὶς and τι.

⁶⁰ Though this tactic certainly creates a persuasive appeal for everyone to be on 'pins and needles' for what Jesus would say next.

John 8:10b may be the trickiest question asked by Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.⁶¹ Jesus opens his conversation with the woman in the temple courts with two back-to-back questions. As his opening words to the accused, the questions are important as they set up the remainder of the dialogue between the two.⁶² The first prefaces the second by asking an indexical question based on a variable form in order to refocus the woman's attention on the 'they,' her accusers, so that Jesus can ask a very biased question: "No one has condemned you?" Jesus' question is based on a polar form; at its information-seeking base, it expects a "yes" or "no" answer, but the bias quality surpasses its base polar construction. There are two points of bias within the question. First, the choice of *κατακρίνω* as verb signals a mild bias. Commentators often remark on the 'technical' (and unJohannine) use of the verb to imply a 'passing of sentence upon,' as opposed to general judgment.⁶³ Any type of word that expresses judgment or condemnation will likely carry some degree of bias in average discourse.

Second, the use of the pronoun *οὐδεὶς* introduces a strong bias into the questions. In this situation, *οὐδεὶς* functions as a negative polar item; but the trick with these kinds of negative polar items is determining whether they render the question positive or negative in polarity. At first, we may be tempted to think *οὐδεὶς* logically represents "no one," meaning the question carries a negative polarity and, typically speaking, expects a positive answer.⁶⁴ However, from a logical perspective, *οὐδεὶς* actually embeds *two* negative polar items: "not" and "any."⁶⁵ Therefore, Jesus' question maintains a positive polarity, and expects a negative answer. This is the reason why Jesus' question feels vague: "No one has sentenced you?" can be answered either, "Yes, no one has sentenced me," or "No, no one has sentenced me," without either seeming to be inaccurate. In all likelihood, this is also the reason the narrator has the woman simply repeat *οὐδεὶς* back to Jesus as her response—a classic example of the use of a repair function in an echo declarative. At the same time, the strong bias

⁶¹ I treat 8:10b as part of John only in the sense most modern readers receive it that way today. I do not argue the pericope is original to the Fourth Gospel.

⁶² Contra, for example, Westcott, *Gospel According to St John*, 127; and Ridderbos, *Gospel of John*, 290.

⁶³ For example, see Von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:911; Comfort and Hawley, *Opening the Gospel of John*, 346; and "*κατακρίνω*," BDAG, 519.

⁶⁴ Cf. McKay, *New Syntax*, 92.

⁶⁵ This is not uncommon, but it can be difficult to spot, as a survey of modern erotetic literature reveals.

telegraphs Jesus' opinion to the woman.⁶⁶ The result of Jesus' question is this: After asking the woman allegedly caught in adultery to refocus on her departed accusers, Jesus uses a strongly biased (polar) question to persuade her to accept the truth that there is no one who will sentence her.⁶⁷ The question is not affirming; it is arresting to bring the woman to the point of realization about the people who brought her in. It certainly calls upon her to speak and respond.⁶⁸ Modern readers also notice this same arresting quality, and it is part of the reason this pericope is well-known and oft-quoted in definitive terms.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Cf. Augustine, *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 33.6.

⁶⁷ Cf. Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 336.

⁶⁸ For the call to respond, see for example Schnackenburg, *Gospel According to John*, 2:167; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 147; and Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1972), 312.

⁶⁹ The *Pericope Adulterae* has a long and sordid history in the reception and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. The two questions arising from the discussion of its reception are usually: Does it belong in John? Does it go back to the historical Jesus? Based on the stylistic evidence of how John treats interrogatives, there is no evidence either for or against inclusion, and no indication either way for its relationship to the historical Jesus.

CHAPTER TEN

ANSWERS AND QUESTIONS

I am sick of questions . . .
—Frodo Baggins

What are we to make of the questions of Jesus in John? The most frequent assumption among educated readers of the Fourth Gospel is that they are simply grammatical vehicles helping to carry the narrative along, at times formulating theological assertions, much the same as any of Jesus' propositions. If this is true, John betrays Jesus as a true Sophist.¹ However, in looking at the deeper logic and rhetoric of some of the questions of Jesus in John, we can now say this assumption no longer holds water. On the basis of the findings of this study, we can say this assumption is an oversimplification that misses the trees for the forest. The questions asked by Jesus (and others) do act as grammatical vehicles to help move dialogue along—but they do much more than just this. If we were to think of the questions of Jesus in John as a motif, similar to 'Word,' 'living water,' or 'light of the world' for example, Jesus' questions would immediately jump to the top of the list based on number and impact alone. We can no longer consider questions simple grammatical devices without importance for studying John.

For millennia, readers have noted one of the first utterances from God to people is a question—a question that matters not because of what God *says* but rather what God *asks*: "Where are you?" (Gen 3:9). Here God's variable question so intensely communicates the void into which Adam and Eve have fallen, as well as the degree to which God wants to know 'where' they are. In the same way, John carefully selects a question to be the first utterance of Jesus: "What do you seek?" (John 1:38a). Not just a question, a question that asks what John also asks the reader: "What do you seek?" We scrutinized John 1:38a in a case study in Chapter 6 to better understand the question's ability to make the reader reflect and think. But the question in John 1:38a is not only a sequence question; it is very much a loaded

¹ As put by Michel Meyer: "For the sophist, questioning serves only as a pretext for giving his own opinion as an answer"; in Meyer, "Dialectic and Questioning," 281.

question. Loaded questions are highly persuasive questions for a narrator to ask as they possess built-in presumptions that ensnare readers. When John selects his hero's first words, John not only does so to push readers to ask themselves, "What do I seek?" but also persuades the reader into accepting John's presupposition: namely that the reader is (and should be) seeking something. Alan Culpepper remarks that Jesus' opening words are "one of the great existential questions of life," but John's use is a bit more subtle (though no less important).² John opens with this question of Jesus not because he wants to encourage the reader to reflect on life in general, but because he wants to push the reader to reflect on his or her life. The Johannine Jesus asks a loaded question to presume on readers—no matter the mountains they may have climbed or the walls they may have scaled—they still haven't found what they are looking for. They should consider and reflect on the answers and questions Jesus brings. If anything, this is reinforced with reminders to the reader of Jesus' questions before and after the resurrection (1:38; 18:4,7).³ In reading John, one begins to wonder whether the *real* questioner is the Johannine Jesus or the Johannine narrator.

In the end, it seems the Johannine Jesus asks questions for many reasons, all of which play an important and vital role in the development of the Fourth Gospel, from narrative stimulation to persuasive discourse. There's more. Since we have already looked at the deep logic and rhetoric of many of Jesus' questions, only to find there is a recurrent theme of persuasion aimed at the reader, what would happen if we consider all of the questions together? Here, a majority of the questions Jesus asked (limited to the more obvious examples, and each stripped of their non-essential phrases and clauses):⁴

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| • What do you seek? | John 1:38 |
| • Do you believe? | John 1:50 |
| • You don't understand these things? | John 3:10 |
| • How will you believe? | John 3:12 |
| • Do you want to be made healthy? | John 5:6 |
| • How can you believe? | John 5:44 |
| • How will you believe? | John 5:47 |
| • Do you take offense at this? | John 6:61 |

² Culpepper, *Gospel and Letters of John*, 122. And similarly noted by Rudolf Bultmann; see Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 100.

³ Smith, "Seeking Jesus" in the Gospel of John," 52.

⁴ The main clause is what controls the force of the sentence; see Sinclair, *Trust the Text*, 109.

- What if you might see? John 6:62
- Did I not choose you? John 6:70
- Why [is it] me you seek to kill? John 7:19
- No one has sentenced you? John 8:10*
- What did I say to you? John 8:25
- Why do you not understand? John 8:43
- Which of you convicts me? John 8:46a
- Why do you not believe? John 8:46b
- Do you believe? John 9:35
- For which are you stoning me? John 10:32
- Do you believe? John 11:26
- Didn't I say that if you would have believed? John 11:40
- Do you know what I have done to you? John 13:12
- Will you lay down your life for Me? John 13:38
- You have not come to know me? John 14:9
- Do you not believe? John 14:10
- Are you seeking about this? John 16:19*
- Do you now believe? John 16:31*
- Whom do you seek? John 18:4
- Whom do you seek? John 18:7
- Should I not drink the cup? John 18:11
- Why ask me? John 18:21
- Why beat me? John 18:23
- Do you say this on your own behalf? *or* John 18:34
Did others say this to you about me?
- Why do you weep? John 20:15a
- Whom do you seek? John 20:15b
- Have you believed? John 20:29
- Do you love me? John 21:15
- Do you love me? John 21:16
- Do you love me? John 21:17⁵

From this perspective, many of Jesus' questions have a very similar feel to John 1:38. If we approach the questions of Jesus in John in this way, a distinct repetition emerges:

- Whom do you seek?
- Do you believe in me?

The questions of Jesus in John keep coming back to these two fundamental questions, and in doing so, intentionally lead the reader back to these

⁵ Verses with asterisks: Jn 8:10 is probably not part of the original gospel, but I include it here from a reader's perspective. Jn 16:19 is my literal wording. Jn 16:31 is questioned by some interpreters as to whether it is a question; I also am not convinced it is a question. However, since NA²⁷ treats it as a question, I include it here.

same two fundamental questions also. Here's why: Almost all of the questions of Jesus in John are a part of John's persuasive discourse scheme. An alert and experienced reader understands this because the narrator makes the purpose of the scheme relatively clear: I, John, wrote these "so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:31). Based on what we now know of Jesus' questions, asking again, "What are we to make of the questions of Jesus in John?" two answers rise to the top.

John, a Dialectical Gospel

John is a dialectical gospel.⁶ Technically, all narrative is minimally dialectical as this is a part of its nature.⁷ Far more than this, the Fourth Gospel is dialectical as it purposely uses a repetitious question scheme between the narrator and the reader in order to narrow the reader down to the reasonable position that Jesus is the Christ.⁸ Eleonore Stump defines the classical dialectical argument this way:

A dialectical disputation arises from a problem (πρόβλημα), which is a question of this form: "Is the world eternal or not?" or, "Is pleasure to be chosen or not?" Not every question of this form is a problem, but only those that are controversial, because problems are issues for disputation, and no disputant would be willing to argue for what is altogether unbelievable or against what seems to be established truth. So to be a dialectical problem, a question of this form must be one stemming from disagreement among the many, among the wise, or between the many and the wise.⁹

⁶ I use the term "dialectical" in the manner I understand the Greek philosophers to have used the term: Dialectic is the art of dialogue (specifically questioning) useful for winnowing a reasonable argument so as to get to the heart of the matter; it is naturally persuasive and is related to the art of rhetoric; see especially Plato, *Phaedr.* 261a–266d; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 2.106, 3.48, 7.42; and Marta Spranzi, *The Art of Dialectic between Dialogue and Rhetoric: The Aristotelian Tradition*, Controversies 9 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), 9. I do not use the term "dialectical" in a strict Aristotelian or a modern, philosophical sense of the term (as the latter is often used in Johannine studies).

⁷ Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, 363; cf. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 11; and Fahnestock and Secor, *A Rhetoric of Argument*, 343.

⁸ In the past, a few other Johannine scholars—notably C. K. Barrett and Paul Anderson—have suggested John is a dialectical Gospel. See for example, Barrett, *New Testament Essays*, 49–69; and Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, 137–65.

⁹ Eleonore Stump, *Dialectic and Its Place in the Development of Medieval Logic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 12. For a similar account, see Spranzi, *Art of Dialectic*, 17–20.

In John, we can summarize the problem in the mind of the narrator as: “Do you believe in Jesus?”¹⁰ This is the problem, and it is highly controversial for the implied reader. It is a question to which any meaningful solution must be discussed and debated. Quite clearly, it is the narrator’s goal to persuade the audience to dispute this very question, and then convince them through the question and answer process in the gospel narrative.¹¹ Like both Plato and the Talmud, John recognizes truth is more attainable through dialogue (questioning) than didactics (assertions).¹² Questions, more so than assertions, have a greater capacity to jar readers away from their presuppositions.¹³ And the fact that many of the questions of Jesus in John go unanswered—because of the types of questions they are—makes the reading more dialectical, not just more rhetorical.¹⁴ Implicit in John’s dialectical discourse is his truth: John does believe, and John has found what he seeks.

The questions of Jesus reveal from a deep, narrative level John’s gospel is dialectical. Recent Johannine scholarship has correctly recognized John’s symptoms. A few examples: C. K. Barrett describes John’s multi-cultural/multi-religious environment, one that both forces and encourages dialogue and debate with those who did and did not share his views.¹⁵ Mark Stibbe points out the Jesus in John has an “elusive” quality; the way he acts and speaks causes the reader to continually raise fundamental

¹⁰ Note the tendency for dialectical questions to be formed as polar questions.

¹¹ As Paul Anderson recognizes, “one becomes engaged experientially in the reception of the narrative. In that sense, hearers and readers in every generation are drawn dialogically into an imaginary dialogue with the Johannine text and its subject, Jesus, wherein conventional notionalities are challenged”; see Anderson, “From One Dialogue to Another,” 118.

¹² Cf. Howland, *Plato and the Talmud*, 60.

¹³ Turnbull, “Rhetorical Agency as a Property of Questioning,” 219; T. J. G. Whitmarsh, “Philostratus,” in *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One*, ed. Irene de Jong, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie, MNS 257 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 433; Robin Waterfield, introduction to *Meno and Other Dialogues: Charmides, Laches, Lysis, Meno*, by Plato, trans. Robin Waterfield, OWC (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), xl; and cf. Zillman, “Rhetorical Elicitation,” 163.

¹⁴ Cf. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 55, 89–90, 131; and Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, 3.

¹⁵ Barrett, *New Testament Essays*, 68. Further, Barrett expounds: “That John had the original and creative mind—the Socratic mind that is capable of asking itself questions, and arguing with itself—is written on every page of the Gospel; that he never disputed with Jews, Greeks, and his fellow-Christians, seems highly improbable”; and contra Augustus Tholuck, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Charles P. Krauth (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1859), 10.

questions about him.¹⁶ Tom Thatcher shows Jesus in John to be a riddler, constantly using riddles (an “interrogative statement that intentionally obscures its referent . . . and asks the audience to name it”) to provoke the audience into answering.¹⁷ Paul Duke finds the repetition of embedded irony in interrogative utterances forces the reader to engage and discover the truth for themselves.¹⁸ George Kennedy explains how John’s strong rhetoric is designed to arrest readers’ attention to the truth of the gospel.¹⁹ Paul Anderson sees many of John’s deckled-edged devices—those frequently disparaged by skeptical readers—as an ingenious ploy by John to “hook the reader” in every generation.²⁰ And then there are Jesus’ questions, overt indicators of John’s selection of persuasive discourse. These are all symptoms—questioning, reflecting, deciding, responding, coercing, misunderstanding, eluding, riddling, dialoguing and many, many more—of John’s dialectical condition that readers find contagious. John’s goal is for the reader to engage and be convinced, “Now you believe!?” (John 16:31).²¹

John, a Rhetorical Gospel

John is also a rhetorical gospel.²² Much like its dialectical quality, it is in the nature of narrative to be minimally rhetorical. Far more than this, the Fourth Gospel is rhetorical as it purposely uses a repetitious scheme of questions with varying degrees of rhetorical quality between the narrator and the reader in order to push and persuade the reader into believing Jesus is the Christ. For any reader of the Gospel, the vanguard of repeti-

¹⁶ Stibbe, *John’s Gospel*, 5–31. I would add to Stibbe’s arguments: the Johannine Jesus is not elusive so as to *elude*, he is elusive so as to *persuade*.

¹⁷ Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 3.

¹⁸ Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, 29, 32, 35; and echoed in Culpepper, “Reading Johannine Irony,” 195.

¹⁹ Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 113.

²⁰ Anderson, “From One Dialogue to Another,” 110.

²¹ Robert Wardy notes, “the dialectical questioner succeeds when he bewilders the respondent, when he *deprives* him of the understanding” in order to bring about the truth; see Robert Wardy, *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and their Successors*, *Issues in Ancient Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1996), 116.

²² I find there is an implicit assumption among modern readers that rhetoric is only an oral art form. While rhetoric probably began as more of an oral art form, and some rhetoricians such as Aristotle continued to focus more on the oral aspects, it quickly became a narrative art form as well. Certainly this was the case by the time of the composition of the New Testament. Some Greek rhetoricians even classify rhetoric as type of textual—not oral—device; see Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 3.86–87.

tious questions charging the reader throughout the narrative is itself an attempt at persuasion.²³ And the persuasive effect of repetitious questions is cumulative. In this book, we examined seventeen of the questions of Jesus in John, and all were a part of John's persuasive discourse to some degree. In these examples, even the questions in John which normally—outside of John—would not carry a noticeable persuasive spin seem to do so in the Fourth Gospel (for example, John 5:6, 7:19b and 11:26b). Taken as a whole, almost eighty percent of the questions of Jesus in John have an overt orientation toward reader persuasion.²⁴

To add to this, the Gospel of John is not some dialectical and some rhetorical—it is fully dialectical *and* rhetorical. Dialectic and rhetoric are two of a kind; they are complementary parts of a musical number (ἀντίστροφος), orchestrated to each other.²⁵ In the ancient world, as exemplified by Socrates, speakers used dialectic as a way to build up the rhetoric of their persuasive discourse. In the same way, John's narrative builds from its dialectical nature so as to become rhetorical and function as persuasive discourse. In most narratives, the primary role of questions is usually to move the characters along by informing dialogue; but in John, we have enough evidence to suspect the primary role of questions may be to move the reader along to persuade their personal dialogue. As Socrates once asked: "Is not rhetoric in its entire nature an art which leads the soul by means of words?"²⁶ In the Fourth Gospel, what Jesus says and what Jesus asks seems to do just that.

In *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, Burton Mack claims, "reduced to normal rules of reasoning, Johannine argumentation is patently illogical. If compared with the normal rules of rhetoric, it is not persuasive."²⁷ Let's try to hold Mack's claim up to the light of reality: In its nearly two thousand year reception, the Gospel of John has proven to be one of

²³ The repetition of questions is a well-known technique for influencing an audience, even to the point where it can profoundly alter a listener's perspective on life and events; see for example, Debra A. Poole and Lawrence T. White, "Effects of Question Repetition on the Eyewitness Testimony of Children and Adults," *Developmental Psychology* 27:6 (1991): 985.

²⁴ A few critics, such as Amos Wilder, have lambasted John's use of questions as "inept," but such a perspective clearly misses the point of why questions exist in persuasive discourse; see for example, Amos N. Wilder, *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 56.

²⁵ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1354a.

²⁶ Plato, *Phaedr.* 261a.

²⁷ Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 88.

humanity's most persuasive texts, especially since John is arguably the most widely read book in the New Testament canon. There are only a few political and religious narratives that are even close to John's league. Contrary to Mack's hyperbole, the Gospel of John—with all of its rough edges assumed by modern readers—has proven remarkably resilient in the area of persuasion.²⁸ What the real question for us is: Why? Why has the Gospel of John proven to be one of humanity's most persuasive texts? Part and parcel of the answer must be John's inclusion of questions that persuade. In looking at many of Jesus' questions in this book, all were found to be quite logical and reasonable by erotetic logic.²⁹ Much more significantly, the questions of Jesus in John work together to highly persuade—if not badger—the reader into considering things the reader may never consider otherwise: "What are you seeking?" and "What if you might see the Son of Man ascending to heaven?" and "Do you want to be made whole?" and most (if not all) of the other questions asked by the Johannine Jesus.

The 'why' question has major implications for the study of the Fourth Gospel. For example, debate has raged among the readers of John as to the gospel's *telos*: whether John composed his narrative of the life of Jesus for insiders—people within Christian community—or outsiders—people who do not believe the Christ is Jesus.³⁰ If we take into account Jesus' questions, one of the most substantial literary devices and points of persuasion in John, they appear aimed far more at the outsider (or 'not-very-far-inside-insider') than the true insider.³¹ This is not to say the questions would not challenge insiders, but their overall intent seems clearly pre-

²⁸ In my work *The Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*, I show where many modern assumptions about John do not hold water when modern philosophical expectations are extracted from the equation. There are, of course, others who have done this as well, not just in biblical studies but also in the study of the works of Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, and many others; for details, see Estes, *Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel*.

²⁹ Truthfully, we shouldn't expect otherwise. Any polished narrative conforming to natural discourse will possess a reasonable degree of erotetic logic. Any child of school age in the modern era could accomplish the same.

³⁰ Purpose being something "which every art must possess"; see Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.15.38.

³¹ Contra Harald Riesenfeld, "Zu den johanneischen ἵνα-Σätzen," *Studia Theologica* 19:1–2 (1965): 213–20; and Tom Thatcher, *Why John Wrote a Gospel: Jesus—Memory—History* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 158. Ben Witherington III argues John's rhetoric shows it "was written for Christians to use with outsiders"; see Witherington, *New Testament Rhetoric*, 21.

disposed to challenging outsiders.³² The questions of Jesus in John reveal major evidence to corroborate the evangelistic purpose of the Fourth Gospel.³³ Thus, our study of the questions of Jesus bring us close to George Kennedy's point: "John's Gospel is radical Christian rhetoric in its demand for immediate and direct response to the truth."³⁴

Future Questions

The questions of Jesus in John only scratch the surface of a more accurate appreciation of interrogatives in biblical texts. In this book, I have shown it is no longer sufficient to either dismiss questions in biblical texts as "just a question," or to manipulate them into theological statements. Unfortunately, I was only able to consider in detail a percentage of the questions of Jesus in John. As case studies, I hope these will prove to be samples for future exegetical work in not only John but also other biblical books as well. I believe further work in how questions inform the dialectical and rhetorical functions of ancient narrative would prove valuable to the study of all of the gospels. Furthermore, if commentators on John (and other biblical books) can begin to deal more effectively with the logic and rhetoric of questions, it will help question-related devices (such as irony, interrogation, dialogue, and more) to come alive in critical readings like never before.

There were many avenues in the logic and use of questions in narrative that I could not treat exhaustively in this book. When you couple the lack of interest in questions in biblical studies, with the complexity difference between questions and propositions, there is much, much more work we need to do on interrogatives. In addition, understanding

³² In Tom Thatcher's work on the riddles of Jesus, he implies riddles are an example of the insider-speak of John (e.g., Thatcher, *Jesus the Riddler*, 150). I would nuance this in two ways: First, it is quite likely that even if John were evangelistic, there still would be apologetic elements included; second, riddles, as an interrogative form, may distinguish between recipients and general audience, but this doesn't mean they are not persuasive to a general audience. Like some other forms of questions, riddles are highly omnidirectional. Human tendency is to be intrigued by and to try to solve any riddle encountered, regardless of whom it was originally intended. It is also possible Witherington is correct, and thus the riddles were meant for Christians to decode evangelistically for their outsider neighbors.

³³ For a recent summary of additional evidence John composed the gospel for outsiders, see Edward W. Klink, III, *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 141 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 213–20.

³⁴ Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 113.

the dynamics of the questions of other characters in other biblical books would prove fruitful for a better understanding of their book's narrative dynamics and characterization. Plus there is much we don't understand about the importance of questions in the ancient world; from Chrysippus to Socrates, questions played a much greater role in logic, rhetoric and communication than we understand. We severely underestimate the importance of questions in the ancient world. As modern scholars, we are trained to ask the questions and seek out the answers—we're not trained in providing answers to questions we don't ask.

Socrates famously remarked that the problem with written works is they cannot be questioned; thus while they sound intelligent, they really just say the same things over and over again.³⁵ John, I am sure, would disagree. No matter—John is no Socrates. The more apt comparison of John would be to Plato, a disciple who recorded his teacher's questions to persuade future audiences by the power of his teachers' words.

³⁵ Plato, *Phaedr.* 275d.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.
- . *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1905.
- Abioye, Taiwo O. "Typology of Rhetorical Questions as a Stylistic Device in Writing." *International Journal of Language, Society and Culture* 29 (2009): 1–8.
- Adger, David. *Core Syntax: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ahluwalia, Rohini, and Robert E. Burnkrant. "Answering Questions about Questions: A Persuasion Knowledge Perspective for Understanding the Effects of Rhetorical Questions." *Journal of Consumer Research* 31.1 (2004): 26–42.
- Ajdukiewicz, Kazimierz. *Logiczne Podstawy Nauczania*. Warszawa, 1934.
- Aland, Kurt, Barbara Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum: Graece et Latine*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.
- Albrecht, Michael von. *Cicero's Style: A Synopsis*. MNS 245. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Alexander, Patrick H., John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley A. Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Allan, Rutger J., and Michel Buijs, eds. *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*. ASCP 13. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Allen, Spencer L. "Understanding Amos vi 12 in Light of his other Rhetorical Questions." *VT* 58 (2008): 437–448.
- Aloni, Maria, Alastair Butler, and Paul Dekker, eds. *Questions in Dynamic Semantics*. CRiS/PI 17. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2007.
- Aloni, Maria, and Paul Égré. "Alternative Questions and Knowledge Attributions." *PQ* 60:238 (2010): 1–27.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic, 1981.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1997.
- . *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Anderson, Paul N., Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. SBLECL 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Anderson, R. Dean, Jr. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms: Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 24. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Antiphon. *The Speeches*. Edited by Michael Gagarin. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Antiphon and Andocides*. Translated by Michael Gagarin and Douglas M. MacDowell. The Oratory of Classical Greece 1. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.
- Aoun, Joseph, and Yen-hui Audrey Li. *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: The Diversity of Wh-Constructions*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 40. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.
- Apostel, Leo. "Assertion Logic and Theory of Argumentation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 4:2 (1971): 92–110.

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Aristotle: On Interpretation; Commentary by St. Thomas and Cajetan*. Translated by Jean T. Oesterle. Medieval Philosophical Texts in Translation. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1962.
- . *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels Collected out of the Works of the Fathers*. Volume Four: St. John. Translated by John Henry Newman. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845.
- Åqvist, Lennart. *A New Approach to the Logical Theory of Interrogatives: Analysis and Formalization*. TBzL 65. Tübingen: Narr, 1975.
- Aristophanes. *Birds and Other Plays*. Translated by Stephen Halliwell. OWC. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Aristotle. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Translated by John Henry Freese. LCL 193. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- . *Categories and De Interpretatione*. Translated by J. L. Ackrill. Clarendon Aristotle Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- . *The Categories, On Interpretation and Prior Analytics*. Translated by Harold P. Cook and Hugh Tredennick. LCL 325. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- . *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. 2nd ed. Translated by George A. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . *On Sophistical Refutations, On Coming-to-Be and Passing-Away and On the Cosmos*. Translated by E. S. Forster and D. J. Furley. LCL 400. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- . *Poetics*. Translated by Stephen Halliwell. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- . *Posterior Analytics*. 2nd ed. Translated by Jonathan Barnes. Clarendon Aristotle Series. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- . *Posterior Analytics and Topica*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick and E. S. Forster. LCL 391. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- . *Problems, Books 32–38 and Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Translated by W. S. Hett and H. Rackham. LCL 317. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Aronoff, Mark, and Janie Rees-Miller, eds. *The Handbook of Linguistics*. BHL. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Asher, Nicholas, and Alex Lascarides. "Questions in Dialogue." *LP* 21:3 (1998): 237–309.
- Asher, Nicholas, and Brian Reese. "Intonation and Discourse: Biased Questions." *ISIS* 8 (2007): 1–38.
- Ashton, John. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- , ed. *The Interpretation of John*. 2nd ed. Studies in New Testament Interpretation. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Athanasiadou, Angeliki. "The Discourse Function of Questions." *Pragmatics* 1:1 (1991): 107–122.
- Augustine. *Tractates on the Gospel of John*. 5 vols. Translated by John W. Rettig. FC 78, 79, 88, 90, 92. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
- Aune, David E. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Ayers, Robert H. *Language, Logic, and Reason in the Church Fathers: A Study of Tertullian, Augustine, and Aquinas*. Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien 6. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1979.
- Babbitt, Frank Cole. "The Use of $\mu\eta$ in Questions." *HSCP* 12 (1901): 307–317.
- Bach, Emmon. "Questions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 2:2 (1971): 153–166.
- Baker, George P., and Henry B. Huntington. *The Principles of Argumentation*. Rev. ed. Boston: Ginn, 1905.
- Bakker, Egbert J. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. BCAW. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Ballif, Michelle, and Michael G. Moran, eds. *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*. Westport: Praeger, 2005.

- Baltussen, Han. "Dialectic in Dialogue: The Message of Plato's *Protagoras* and Aristotle's *Topics*." In *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, edited by E. Anne Mackay, 203–225. *Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* 7. MNS 298. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Bambrough, Renford. "Gods and Giants." *The Listener* (July, 1951).
- Bandman, Bertram. *The Place of Reason in Education*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1967.
- Barber, Kimberly Anne. *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo: An Interpretation*. *Studies in Classics* 6. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Barnes, Jonathan. "Aristotle's Theory of Demonstration." *Phronesis* 14:2 (1969): 123–152.
- Barr, James. "Why?" in Biblical Hebrew." *JTS* 36:1 (1985): 1–33.
- Barrett, C. K. *Essays on John*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- . *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- . *New Testament Essays*. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Baxter, James S., Julian C. W. Boon, and Charles Marley. "Interrogative Pressure and Responses to Minimally Leading Questions." *Personality and Individual Differences* 40 (2006): 87–98.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. 2nd ed. WBC 36. Waco: Word, 1999.
- Beck, David R. *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel*. BIS 27. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Beck, Deborah. "Narratology and Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Homeric Speech Representation." *TAPA* 138:2 (2008): 351–378.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. 2 vols. ÖTKNT 4. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979–1981.
- Bell, Martin. "Questioning." *PQ* 25:100 (1975): 193–212.
- Belle, Gilbert van, J. G. Van der Watt, and P. Maritz, eds. *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*. BETL 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Belnap, Nuel D., Jr. "Declaratives Are Not Enough." *Philosophical Studies* 59:1 (1990): 1–30.
- . "Questions, Answers, and Presuppositions." *JPhil* 63:20 (1966): 609–611.
- . "S-P Interrogatives." *JPL* 1:3/4 (1972): 331–346.
- Belnap, Nuel D., Jr., and Thomas B. Steel, Jr. *The Logic of Questions and Answers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Benitez, Eugenio. "Argument, Rhetoric, and Philosophic Method: Plato's 'Protagoras'." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25:3 (1992): 222–252.
- Bennema, Cornelis. *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2:148. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Bennett, Michael. "A Response to Karttunen on Questions." *LP* 1:2 (1977): 279–300.
- Bernard, J. H. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1928.
- Besnard, Philippe, and Anthony Hunter. *Elements of Argumentation*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008.
- Black, Max, ed. *Philosophical Analysis: A Collection of Essays*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950.
- Blakemore, Diane. *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. BTL. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Blank, David L. "The Arousal of Emotion in Plato's Dialogues." *CQ* 43:2 (1993): 428–439.
- Blankenship, Kevin L., and Traci Y. Craig. "Rhetorical Question Use and Resistance to Persuasion: An Attitude Strength Analysis." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 25:2 (2006): 111–128.

- Blass, Friedrich. *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Translated by Henry Thackeray. London: MacMillan, 1905.
- Blass, Friedrich, and A. DeBrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and Edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bloomer, Aileen, Patrick Griffiths, and Andrew John Merrison. *Introducing Language in Use: A Coursebook*. Oxford: Routledge, 2005.
- Boethius, Anicius Manlius Severinus. *Boethius's De Topicis Differentiis*. Translated by Eleonore Stump. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Bolinger, Dwight. *Interrogative Structures of American English*. Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1957.
- Bond, R. Warwick, ed. *Early Plays from the Italian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Bonney, William. *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story as the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*. BIS 62. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Booth, Wayne C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John*. New American Commentary 25A–B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001–2002.
- Borowitz, Eugene B. *The Talmud's Theological Language-Game: A Philosophical Discourse Analysis*. SUNY Series in Jewish Philosophy. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Botha, J. Eugene. *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1–42*. NovTSup 65. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.
- Bousfield, Derek, and Miriam A. Locher, eds. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Language, Power and Social Process 21. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.
- Bradley, Mark Alan. "The Functions of Questions in the Fourth Gospel: A Narrative-Critical Inquiry." PhD diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994. UMI.
- Braet, Antoine C. "Hermagoras and the Epicheireme." *Rhetorica* 22:4 (2004): 327–347.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A. *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Bromberger, Sylvain. *On What We Know We Don't Know: Explanation, Theory, Linguistics, and How Questions Shape Them*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . "Questions." *JPhil* 63:20 (1966): 597–606.
- . "Rational Ignorance." *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 47–64.
- . "Why-Questions." In *Mind and Cosmos: Essays in Contemporary Science and Philosophy*, edited by Robert G. Colodny, 86–111. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966.
- Brook, Eric C. "The Interrogative Model: Historical Inquiry and Explanation." *JPH* 1 (2007): 137–159.
- Brown, H. Paul, Brian D. Joseph, and Rex E. Wallace. "Questions and Answers." In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Vol. 1, *Syntax of the Sentence*, edited by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 489–530. TSLM 180.1. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. ABC 29–29A. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- . *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Brown, Tricia Gates. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-scientific Perspective*. JSNTSup 253. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

- Brueggemann, Walter A. "Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions." *JBL* 92:3 (1973): 358–374.
- Bruin, John. *Homo Interrogans: Questioning and the Intentional Structure of Cognition*. Philosophica 53. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2001.
- Bruns, J. Edgar. *The Art and Thought of John*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- Buch-Hansen, Gitte. "It is the Spirit that Gives Life": A Stoic Understanding of Pneuma in John's Gospel. BZNW 173. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Bühler, Karl. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1934.
- Bühlmann, Walter, and Karl Scherer. *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; Ein Nachschlagewerk*. Giessen: Brunnen, 1994.
- Buijs, Michel. *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse: The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis*. MNS 260. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Das Problem der Hermeneutik." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 47 (1950): 47–69.
- . *The Gospel of John*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Burger, Ronna. *Plato's Phaedrus: A Defense of a Philosophic Art of Writing*. University: University of Alabama Press, 1980.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 56. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898.
- Burt, Harold E., and Harold V. Gaskill. "Suggestibility and the Form of the Question." *JAP* 16:4 (1932): 358–373.
- Butler, Paul. *Out of Style: Reanimating Stylistic Study in Composition and Rhetoric*. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2008.
- Cable, Seth. *The Grammar of Q: Q-Particles, Wh-Movement, and Pied-Piping*. OCS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *Jesus: What Manner of Man*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2008.
- Cain, Rebecca Bensen. *The Socratic Method: Plato's Use of Philosophical Drama*. CSAP. London: Continuum, 2007.
- Callender, Aimee A., and Mark A. McDaniel. "The Benefits of Embedded Question Adjuncts for Low and High Structure Builders." *JEP* 99:2 (2007): 339–348.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Translated by William Pringle. Calvin's Commentaries 17–18. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
- Campbell, Joan Cecelia. *Kinship Relations in the Gospel of John*. CBQMS 42. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.
- Canetti, Elias. *Crowds and Power*. Translated by Carol Stewart. New York: Continuum, 1981.
- Cappelen, Herman, and Ernie Lepore. "Indexicality, Binding, Anaphora and A Priori Truth." *Analysis* 62:4 (2002): 271–281.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology and Textual Transmission*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Carawan, E. M. "Erotesis: Interrogation in the Courts of Fourth-Century Athens." *GRBS* 24:3 (1983): 209–226.
- Carlson, Lauri. *Dialogue Games: An Approach to Discourse Analysis*. SLL. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1985.
- Carroll, Noël. "Narrative Closure." *Philosophical Studies* 135:1 (2007): 1–15.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Casey, Maurice. *Is John's Gospel True?* New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Caton, Charles E. "Essentially Arising Questions and the Ontology of a Natural Language." *Noûs* 5:1 (1971): 27–37.

- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*. New York: Garland, 1997.
- Cheung, Yam-Leung. "The Negative Wh-Construction." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2008. UMI.
- Cho, Sukmin. *Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel*. NTM 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.
- Cicero. *De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum and Topica*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. LCL 386. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- . *De Oratore*. Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. LCL 348–349. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959–1960.
- [Cicero]. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. LCL 403. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Clark, Robin. *Meaningful Games: Exploring Language with Game Theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.
- Clark-Soles, Jaime. *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Clarke, M. L. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*. Rev. ed. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Cobb, W. H. "μὴ Interrogative." *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 4:1–2 (1884): 148–149.
- Cohen, Felix S. "What is a Question?" *The Monist* 39 (1929): 350–364.
- Collingwood, R. G. *An Essay on Metaphysics*. Rev. ed. Edited by Rex Martin. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Collins, Raymond F. *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*. LTPM 2. Louvain: Peeters, 1990.
- Combs, Blinn Ellis. "Plato's *Euthyphro*: An Examination of the Socratic Method in the Definitional Dialogues." PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2011.
- Comfort, Philip. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005.
- Comfort, Philip W., and Wendell C. Hawley. *Opening the Gospel of John: A Fresh Resource for Teaching and Preaching the Fourth Gospel*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1994.
- Conley, Thomas M. "The Enthymeme in Perspective." *QJS* 70:2 (1984): 168–187.
- Connolly, Joy. *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Coolidge, Frederick L., and Thomas Wynn. "Recursion, Phonological Storage Capacity, and the Evolution of Modern Speech." In *The Prehistory of Language: Studies in the Evolution of Language*, edited by Rudolf Botha and Chris Knight, 244–254. Studies in the Evolution of Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cooper, Alan. "The Absurdity of Amos 6:12a." *JBL* 107:4 (1988): 725–727.
- Coste, Didier. *Narrative as Communication*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Coulthard, Malcolm, ed. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Coulthard, Malcolm, and Alison Johnson. *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Countryman, L. William. *The Mystical Way in the Fourth Gospel: Crossing Over into God*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Margret Selting. *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*. SIS 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Craig, Kenneth M., Jr. *Asking For Rhetoric: The Hebrew Bible's Protean Interrogative*. BIS 73. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "Rhetorical Aspects of Questions Answered with Silence in 1 Samuel 14:37 and 28:6." *CBQ* 56:2 (1994): 221–239.
- Crenshaw, James L. "Impossible Questions, Sayings, and Tasks." *Semeia* 17 (1980): 19–34.
- Crosswhite, James. *The Rhetoric of Reason: Writing and the Attractions of Argument*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.

- Cruse, D. A. *Lexical Semantics*. CTL. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- . *How Language Works: How Babies Babble, Words Change Meaning, and Languages Live or Die*. New York: Avery, 2007.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . *The Gospel and Letters of John*. IBT. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- . "The Johannine Hypodeigma: A Reading of John 13." *Semeia* 53 (1991): 133–152.
- . *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- , ed. *Critical Readings of John* 6. BIS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, and C. Clifton Black, eds. *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Cuyckens, Hubert, Thomas Berg, René Dirven and Klaus-Uwe Panther, eds. *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*. CILT 243. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint John*. 2 vols. Translated by P. E. Pusey and Thomas Randell. Oxford/London: James Parker/Walter Smith, 1874–1885.
- Dancygier, Barbara. *Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge and Causation in Conditional Constructions*. CamSL 87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Davidson, Donald. *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 69. Sheffield: JSOT, 1997.
- De Boer, Martinus C. *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*. CBET 17. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- De Jong, Irene, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie, eds. *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One*. MNS 257. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- De Jonge, Marinus, ed. *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie*. BETL 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987.
- De Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Dekker, Paul. "Satisfying Questions." In *SuB8: Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 8*, edited by Cécile Meier and Matthias Weisgerber, 83–94. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, 2004.
- Deman, Thomas. *Socrate et Jésus*. Paris: L'Artisan du Livre, 1944.
- Demetrius. *On Style*. In *Aristotle's Poetics*. Translated by Doreen C. Innes and W. Rhys Roberts. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Devine, A. M., and Laurence D. Stephens. *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . *The Prosody of Greek Speech*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Dickman, Nathan Eric. "Dialogue and Divinity: A Hermeneutics of the Interrogative Mood in Religious Language." PhD diss., University of Iowa, 2009. ProQuest.
- Diel, Paul, and Jeannine Solotareff. *Symbolism in the Gospel of John*. Translated by Nelly Marans. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Dik, Helma. *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Dillon, J. T. "Questioning the Use of Questions." *JEP* 83:1 (1991): 163–164.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. 2 Vols. Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL 184–185. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931, 1972.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- . *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Doetjes, Jenny, and Paz González, eds. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004: Selected Papers from Going Romance 2004*. CILT 278. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006.

- Domeris, W. R. "The Johannine Drama." *JTSA* 42 (1983): 29–35.
- Dominik, William J., ed. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Dominik, William, and Jon Hall, eds. *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. BCAW. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Dorion, Louis-André. "La subversion de l' 'elenchos' juridique dans l' 'Apologie de Socrate.'" *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 88:3 (1990): 311–344.
- Doyle, Charles Clay. "Belaboring the Obvious: Sarcastic Interrogative Affirmatives and Negatives." *Maledicta* 1 (1977): 77–82.
- . "Is the Pope Still Catholic? Historical Observations on Sarcastic Interrogatives." *Western Folklore* 67:1 (2008): 5–33.
- . "Sarcastic Interrogative Affirmatives and Negatives." *Midwestern Journal of Language and Folklore* 1 (1975): 33–34.
- Driver, J. L. "Metaquestions." *Noûs* 18:2 (1984): 299–309.
- Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.
- Dumm, Demetrius R. *A Mystical Portrait of Jesus: New Perspectives on John's Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict? Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Edelman, Samuel M. "Ancient Traditions, Modern Needs: An Introduction to Jewish Rhetoric." *JCR* 26:2 (2003): 113–125.
- Edwards, Mark. *John*. Blackwell Bible Commentaries. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, ed. *Examining Argumentation in Context: Fifteen Studies on Strategic Maneuvering*. Argumentation in Context 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009.
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, and Bart Garssen, eds. *Pondering on Problems of Argumentation: Twenty Essays on Theoretical Issues*. AL 14. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009.
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, and Rob Grootendorst. *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-Dialectical Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, Rob Grootendorst, and A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- Elbert, Paul. "An Observation on Luke's Composition and Narrative Style of Questions." *CBQ* 66:1 (2004): 98–109.
- Elliott, John H. "Jesus the Israelite was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5:2 (2007): 119–154.
- Ellis, Peter F. *The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1984.
- Elmer, Herbert Charles. *A Discussion of the Latin Prohibitive: Based Upon a Complete Collection of the Instances from the Earliest Times to the End of the Augustan Period*. Baltimore: Friedenwald, 1894.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. "Information Packaging in Questions." In *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics: Papers from CSSP 2005*, edited by Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr 6 (2006): 93–112.
- Enzle, Michael E., and Michael D. Harvey. "Rhetorical Requests for Help." *SPQ* 45:3 (1982): 172–176.
- Estes, Douglas. "The Shepherd's Door: An Incarnational Reading of John 10:1–5." *Faith & Mission* 24:1 (2006): 3–23.
- . *The Temporal Mechanics of the Fourth Gospel: A Theory of Hermeneutical Relativity in the Gospel of John*. BIS 92. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne, and Marie Secor. *A Rhetoric of Argument*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992.

- Fales, Walter. "The Phenomenology of Questions." *PPR* 4:1 (1943–44): 60–75.
- Fantham, Elaine. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Farely, Nicolas. *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2.290. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Fava, Elisabetta. "Questioning Interrogative Interpretation in Some Indo-European Languages." *Language Sciences* 18:1–2 (1996): 87–110.
- Fiengo, Robert. *Asking Questions: Using Meaningful Structures to Imply Ignorance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fischel, Henry A. *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York: KTAV, 1977.
- Fischer, David H. *Historians' Fallacies: Towards a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Florici, Franck. "Negation and 'Focus Clash' in Sardinian." In *Information Structure and Its Interfaces*, edited by Lunella Mereu, 129–152. Interface Explorations 19. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.
- Forestell, J. Terence. *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*. AnBib 57. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.
- Fox, Margalit. *Talking Hands: What Sign Language Reveals about the Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007.
- Frank, David A. "Arguing with God, Talmudic Discourse, and the Jewish Countermodel: Implications for the Study of Argumentation." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 41 (2004): 71–86.
- Frank, Jane. "You Call That a Rhetorical Question? Forms and Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Conversation." *JPrag* 14:5 (1990): 723–738.
- Frantz, Donald G. "On Question Word Movement." *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:4 (1973): 531–534.
- Fraser, Bruce. "The Clause Start in Ancient Greek: Focus and the Second Position." *Glotta* 77:3, 4 (2001): 138–177.
- Freed, Alice F., and Susan Ehrlich. "Why Do You Ask?" *The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Freeman, Jane. "'Fair Terms and a Villain's Mind': Rhetorical Patterns in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Rhetorica* 20:2 (2002): 149–172.
- Frege, Gottlob. *Collected Papers on Mathematics, Logic and Philosophy*. Edited by Brian McGuinness. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- . *Kleine Schriften*. 3rd ed. Edited by Ignacio Angelelli. Hildesheim: Olms, 2011.
- . *The Frege Reader*. Blackwell Readers. Edited by Michael Beaney. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Froegel, Shai. *The Rhetoric of Philosophy*. Controversies 3. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.
- Futter, Dylan. "Belief and Persuasion in the Socratic Elenchus." PhD diss., Fordham University, 2010. UMI.
- . "Socratic 'Argument' in Plato's Early Definitional Dialogues." *South African Journal of Philosophy* 30:2 (2011): 122–131.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. *John*. HoNTC 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Gaskin, Richard. *The Unity of the Proposition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Gauker, Christopher. *Words without Meaning*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.
- Geis, Michael L. *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gempf, Conrad. *Jesus Asked: What He Wanted to Know*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Genette, Gérard. *Fiction and Diction*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

- Gibson, Craig A. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan. "Interrogatives: Questions, Facts and Dialogue." In *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, edited by Shalom Lappin, 385–422. London: Blackwell, 1997.
- Glasson, T. F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. SBT 40. London: SCM, 1963.
- Goodwin, William W. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1879.
- Gordis, Robert. "A Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew." *AJSL* 49:3 (1933): 212–217.
- Graesser, Arthur C., Kathy L. Lang, and Richard M. Roberts. "Question Answering in the Context of Stories." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 120:3 (1991): 254–277.
- Graesser, Arthur C., Morton Ann Gernsbacher, Susan R. Goldman, eds. *Handbook of Discourse Processes*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.
- Greenberg, Joseph H., ed. *Universals of Human Language*. 4 vols. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978.
- Grimaldi, William M. A. *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Hermes: Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie 25. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1972.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. "Questions." In *Handbook of Logic and Language*, edited by Johan van Benthem and Alice ter Meulen, 1055–1124. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.
- . "Studies on the Semantics of Questions and the Pragmatics of Answers." PhD diss., University of Amsterdam, 1984.
- Gruber, Helmut. "Questions and Strategic Orientation in Verbal Conflict Sequences." *JPrag* 33:12 (2001): 1815–1857.
- Guéron, Jacqueline, and Jacqueline Lecarme, eds. *The Syntax of Time*. CSL 37. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.
- Guerzoni, Elena, and Yael Sharvit. "A Question of Strength: On NPIs in Interrogative Clauses." *LP* 30 (2007): 361–391.
- Gunderson, Erik, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Gunlogson, Christine. *True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English*. ODL. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *On the Pragmatics of Communication*. Edited by Maeve Cooke. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John*. 2 vols. Translated by Robert Funk. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Hakola, Raimo. *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*. NovTSup 118. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Margret Selting, eds. *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*. SDG 17. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.
- Hamblin, Charles L. "Questions," *AJJP* 36 (1958): 159–168.
- . "Questions Aren't Statements." *Philosophy of Science* 30:1 (1963): 62–63.
- . "Questions in Montague English." *Foundations of Language* 10:1 (1973): 41–53.
- Han, Chung-hye. "Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions." *Lingua* 112 (2002): 201–229.
- Han, Chung-hye, and Maribel Romero. "Negation, Focus and Alternative Questions." In *WCCFL 20: Proceedings of the 20th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, edited by Karine Megerdooian and Leora Anne Bar-el, 262–275. Somerville: Cascadilla, 2001.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

- Harrah, David. "A Logic of Questions and Answers." *Philosophy of Science* 28:1 (1961): 40–46.
- . "On Completeness in the Logic of Questions." *APQ* 6:2 (1969): 158–164.
- . "Question Generators." *JPhil* 63:20 (1966): 606–608.
- . "The Logic of Questions." In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, 2nd ed., edited by Dov M. Gabbay and F. Guenther, 8:1–60. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002.
- . "What Should We Teach About Questions?" *Synthese* 51:1 (1982): 21–38.
- Hayes, Christine Elizabeth. *Between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds: Accounting for Halakhic Difference in Selected Sugyot from Tractate Avodah Zarah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Heaney, James J. "The Logic of Questions and the Existence of God." *RelS* 16:2 (1980): 203–216.
- Heath, Malcolm. "The Substructure of *Stasis*-Theory from Hermagoras to Hermogenes." *CQ* 44:1 (1994): 114–129.
- Heim, Irene. "A Note on Negative Polarity and Downward Entailingness." In *The Proceedings of NELS 14*, edited by Charles Jones and Peter Sells, 98–107. Amherst: GLSA, 1984.
- Heinemann, Trine. "Questions of Accountability: Yes-No Interrogatives that Are Unanswerable." *Discourse Studies* 10:1 (2008): 55–71.
- Henderson, G. P. "On Questions." *Philosophy* 30:115 (1955): 304–317.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM, 1989.
- Heritage, John. "The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content." *JPrag* 34:10–11 (2002): 1427–1446.
- Heritage, John, and Steven Clayman. *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2001.
- Herring, Susan C. "The Grammaticalization of Rhetorical Questions in Tamil." In *Approaches to Grammaticalization: Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues*, edited by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 253–284. Typological Studies in Language 19:1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991.
- Hidary, Richard. "Classical Rhetorical Arrangement and Reasoning in the Talmud: The Case of Yerushalmi Berakhot 11." *AJS Review* 34:1 (2010): 33–64.
- Higginbotham, James. "Interrogatives." In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, edited by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 195–227. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993.
- . "The Semantics of Questions." In *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, edited by Shalom Lappin, 361–383. London: Blackwell, 1997.
- Hintikka, Jaakko. "Questions about Questions." In *Semantics and Philosophy*, edited by Milton K. Munitz and Peter K. Unger, 103–158. New York: New York University Press, 1974.
- . *Socratic Epistemology: Explorations of Knowledge-Seeking by Questioning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Hintikka, Jaakko, and Ilpo Halonen. "Semantics and Pragmatics for Why-Questions." *JPhil* 92:12 (1995): 636–657.
- Hiž, Henry. "Questions and Answers." *JPhil* 59:10 (1962): 253–265.
- Hiž, Henry, ed. *Questions*. SLL. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1978.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*. Edited by William Molesworth. 11 vols. London: John Bohn, 1839–1845.
- Hoffman, Kathryn Vitalis, and Mark Vitalis Hoffman. "Question Marks and Turning Points: Following the Gospel of Mark to Surprising Places." *Word & World* 26:1 (2006): 69–76.
- Holt, Elizabeth, and Rebecca Clift, eds. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Hookins, Tony, and Mike Metcalfe. "A Systemic Development of the Interrogative Pronouns and Adverbs." *Systemic Practice and Action Research* 18:6 (2005): 581–605.

- Hookway, Christopher. "Questions of Context: The Presidential Address." *PAS* 96 (1996): 1–16.
- Hopper, Paul J. *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics: Festschrift for Winfred P. Lehmann*. CILT 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1977.
- Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. *The Fourth Gospel*. Rev. ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1950.
- Howland, Jacob. *Plato and the Talmud*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Huddleston, Rodney. "The Contrast between Interrogatives and Questions." *Journal of Linguistics* 30:2 (1994): 411–439.
- Hudson, Richard A. "The Meaning of Questions." *Language* 51:1 (1975): 1–31.
- Hunter, A. M. *According to John*. London: SCM, 1968.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. 2 vols. Translated by J. N. Findlay. International Library of Philosophy. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Hutchby, Ian. "Power in Discourse: The Case of Arguments on a British Talk Radio Show." *Discourse and Society* 7:4 (1996): 481–497.
- Hyman, Ronald T. "Esther 3:3: The Question with No Response." *JBQ* 22:2 (1994): 103–109.
- . "God, Abraham, Moses: A Comparison of Key Questions." *JBQ* 19:4 (1991): 250–259.
- Ilie, Cornelia. *What Else Can I Tell You? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts*. Stockholm Studies in English 82. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994.
- Isaacs, James, and Kyle Rawlins. "Conditional Questions." *Journal of Semantics* 25:3 (2008): 269–319.
- Iwata, Seizi. "Echo Questions Are Interrogatives? Another Version of a Metarepresentational Analysis." *LP* 26:2 (2003): 185–254.
- Jacobs, Louis. *The Talmudic Argument: A Study in Talmudic Reasoning and Methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Jacquette, Dale. *A Companion to Philosophical Logic*. BCP. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Question and Answer: Forms of Dialogic Understanding*. Edited and Translated by Michael Hays. Theory and History of Literature 68. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Jaworski, William. "The Logic of How-Questions." *Synthese* 166 (2009): 133–155.
- Jespersen, Otto. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924.
- Johnson, Janet L. "Questions and Role Responsibility in Four Professional Meetings." *Anthropological Linguistics* 22:2 (1980): 66–76.
- Johnson, Raymond E. "The Rhetorical Question as a Literary Device in Ecclesiastes." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. SNTSMS 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Johnstone, Barbara. *The Linguistic Individual: Self-Expression in Language and Linguistics*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Edited by Jeri Johnson. OWC. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Kahn, Charles H. *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek: With a New Introductory Essay*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003.
- Kanagaraj, Jey J. *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background*. JSNTSup 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant. Translated and Edited by Paul Guyer and Allen M. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Karttunen, Lauri. "Syntax and Semantics of Questions." *LP* 1:1 (1977): 3–44.
- Katz, Jerrold J., and Paul M. Postal. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1964.

- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Keith, Chris. *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*. NTTSD 38. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Kekes, John. "Skepticism and External Questions." *PPR* 31:3 (1971): 325–340.
- Kelly, David H. "Case: Grammar and Terminology." *CW* 87:1 (1993): 35–39.
- Kenesei, István, and Robert M. Harnish, eds. *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse: A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Vol. 1 of *A History of Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- . *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C.–A.D. 300*. Vol. 2 of *A History of Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- . *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- . *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- . *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- . *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- . *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Studies in Religion. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- . *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- . "The Earliest Rhetorical Handbooks." *AJP* 80:2 (1959): 169–178.
- Kerferd, George B. *The Sophistic Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 220. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Kevelson, Roberta. "How's of Why's and Why's of How's: Relation of Method and Cause in Inquiry." *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 91–106.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Concept of Irony, with Constant Reference to Socrates*. Translated by Lee M. Capel. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Kleiner, Scott A. "Erotetic Logic and Scientific Inquiry." *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 19–46.
- Klink, Edward W., III. *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*. SNTSMS 141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Knight, Thomas. "Questions and Universals." *PPR* 27:4 (1967): 564–576.
- Korta, Kepa, and John Perry. *Critical Pragmatics: An Inquiry into Reference and Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Koshik, Irene. *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction*. SDG 16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- . "What is Truth? Pilate's Question in its Johannine and Larger Biblical Context." *JETS* 48:1 (2005): 33–62.
- Koura, Antti. "An Approach to Why-Questions." *Synthese* 74:2 (1988): 191–206.
- Kracht, Marcus. *The Mathematics of Language*. Studies in Generative Grammar 63. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
- Kubinski, Tadeusz. *An Outline of the Logical Theory of Questions*. Berlin: Akademie, 1980.
- Kuno, Susumu, and Jane J. Robinson. "Multiple Wh Questions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 3:4 (1972): 463–487.
- Kuntz, J. Kenneth. "The Form, Location, and Function of Rhetorical Questions in Deutero-Isaiah." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, Vol. 1, edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, VTSup 70.1, 121–142. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Kysar, Robert. *John*. ACNT. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.

- . *John, the Maverick Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.
- Ladd, D. Robert. "A First Look at the Semantics and Pragmatics of Negative Questions and Tag Questions." *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society* 17 (1981): 164–171.
- Ladusaw, William. "Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations." PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1979. UMI.
- Lamari, Anna A. *Narrative, Intertext, and Space in Euripides' Phoenissae*. Trends in Classics 6. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Lambert, Gregg. "What Questions Fascinate Me?: 'What Do I Want to Know?'" *SubStance* 32:1 (2003): 24–28.
- Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Lapide, Cornelius A. *The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide*. 3rd ed. Vols. 5–6. Translated by Thomas W. Mossman. Edinburgh, John Grant, 1908.
- Lauer, Janice M. *Invention in Rhetoric and Composition*. Reference Guides to Rhetoric and Composition. West Lafayette: Parlor, 2004.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Lawler, John M. "Any Questions?" *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (1971): 163–173.
- Lecercle, Jean-Jacques, and Denise Riley. *The Force of Language*. Language, Discourse, Society. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Lee, Dorothy A. *Flesh and Glory: Symbol, Gender, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. New York: Crossroad, 2002.
- . *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning*. JSNTSup 95. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Lee, Yo-An. "Yes–No Questions in the Third-Turn Position: Pedagogical Discourse Processes." *Discourse Processes* 45 (2008): 237–262.
- Lee-Goldman, Russell. "A Typology of Rhetorical Questions." Paper presented at the Syntax and Semantics Circle, University of California-Berkeley, February 17, 2006.
- Leonardi, Paolo, and Marco Santambrogio. "Pragmatics, Language Games, Questions and Answers." In *Possibilities and Limitations of Pragmatics*, edited by Herman Parret, Marina Sbisa, and Jef Verschueren, 443–472. Studies in Language Companion Series 7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981.
- Lepore, Ernest, and Kirk Ludwig. *Donald Davidson's Truth-Theoretic Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Lerner, Gene H., ed. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. P&BNS 125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. New York: Continuum, 2007.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942.
- Lightfoot, David. *Natural Logic and the Greek Moods*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- Lightstone, Jack N. *The Rhetoric of the Babylonian Talmud: Its Social Meaning and Context*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 6. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1994.
- Lihoreau, Franck, ed. *Knowledge and Questions*. GPS 77. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. BNTC 4. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- . *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Essays on John*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 17. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- . *The Gospel of John*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Ling, Timothy J. M. *The Judean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*. SNTSMS 136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Linville, James R. "Amos among the 'Dead Prophets Society': Re-reading the Lion's Roar." *JSOT* 90 (2000): 55–77.
- Litwack, Eugene. "A Classification of Biased Questions." *AJS* 62:2 (1956): 182–186.
- Liu, Yameng. "Aristotle and the Stasis Theory: A Reexamination." *RSQ* 21:1 (1991): 53–59.
- Llewelyn, John E. "What is a Question?" *AAJP* 42:1 (1964): 69–85.
- Long, Fredrick J. *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*. SNTSMS 131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of New Testament Chain-Link Transitions*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. In *Aristotle's Poetics*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Revised by Donald A. Russell. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1996.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works: Sermons on the Gospel of St. John*. 4 vols. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Daniel E. Poellot. Translated by Martin H. Bertram. *Luther's Works* 22–24. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1961.
- Lyons, John. *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Lytard, Jean-François. *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*. Translation by Georges Van Den Abbeele. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Maccini, Robert Gordon. *Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses According to John*. JSNTSup 125. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- MacGregor, George Hogarth Carnaby. *The Gospel of John*. Moffat New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 43. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Makkai, Adam, and Alan K. Melby, eds. *Linguistics and Philology: Essays in Honor of Rulon S. Wells*. CILT 42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Markosian, Ned. "The Paradox of the Question." *Analysis* 57:2 (1997): 95–97.
- Marková, Ivana, and Klaus Foppa, eds. *The Dynamics of Dialogue*. Berlin: Springer, 1990.
- Mastrorade, Donald J. *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. University of California Publications Classical Studies 21. Berkeley: University of California, 1979.
- Mayo, Bernard. "Deliberative Questions: A Criticism." *Analysis* 16:3 (1956): 58–63.
- Mayordomo, Moisés. *Argumentiert Paulus logisch? Eine Analyse auf dem Hintergrund antiker Logik*. WUNT 188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Mayr, Andrea, ed. *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London: Continuum, 2008.
- Mburu, Elizabeth W. *Qumran and the Origins of Johannine Language and Symbolism*. JCT-CRS 8. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- McCaffrey, James. *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14:2–3*. AnBib 114. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.
- McClymond, Michael J. *Familiar Stranger: An Introduction to Jesus of Nazareth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- McCoy, Marina. *Plato on the Rhetoric of Philosophers and Sophists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- McGrath, James F. *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology*. SNTSMS 111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- McHugh, John F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1–4*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- McKay, Kenneth L. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*. SBG 5. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- McKeon, Richard. "The Hellenistic and Roman Foundations of the Tradition of Aristotle in the West." *Review of Metaphysics* 32 (1979): 677–715.
- McWhorter, Ashton Waugh. "A Study of the So-Called Deliberative Type of Question (τὶ ποιήσω;) as Found in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides." *TPAPA* 41 (1910): 157–167.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovT-Sup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Metzger, Bruce. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. Corrected ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th rev. ed.)*. 2nd ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyer, Michel. "Dialectic and Questioning: Socrates and Plato." *APQ* 17:4 (1980): 281–289.
- . "The Revival of Questioning in the Twentieth Century." *Synthese* 74:1 (1988): 5–18.
- , ed. *Questions and Questioning*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Meyer, Michel, and Marlene L. Cushman. "Argumentation in the Light of a Theory of Questioning." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 15:2 (1982): 81–103.
- Meyer, Roland, and Ina Mleinek. "How Prosody Signals Force and Focus—A Study of Pitch Accents in Russian Yes–No Questions." *JPrag* 38:10 (2006): 1615–1635.
- Mielziner, Moses. *Introduction to the Talmud: Historical and Literary Introduction*. Cincinnati: Bloch, 1894.
- Millikan, Ruth Garrett. *Language: A Biological Model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. "Rhythm and Regularity in Homeric Composition: Questions in the *Odyssey*." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, edited by C. J. Mackie, 21–48. MNS 248. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "The Words of Gods: Divine Discourse in Homer's *Iliad*." In *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion*, edited by A. P. M. H. Lardinois, Josine H. Blok, and Marc G. M. van der Poel, 17–36. Vol. 8 of *Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World*. MNS 332. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Mirhady, David C. "The Disappearance and Reappearance of *Exetasis*." *Mouseion* 8:3 (2008): 395–408.
- Mishler, Elliot G. *The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of Medical Interviews*. Norwood: Ablex, 1984.
- Miyake, Naomi, and Donald A. Norman. "To Ask a Question, One Must Know Enough to Know What is Not Known." *JVLVB* 18:3 (1979): 357–364.
- Moeller, Henry R. and Arnold Kramer. "An Overlooked Structural Pattern in New Testament Greek." *NovT* 5:1 (1962): 25–35.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. SP 4. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1998.
- Montefusco, Lucia Calboli. "Rhetorical Use of Dilemmatic Arguments." *Rhetorica* 28:4 (2010): 363–383.
- Montgomery, David A. "Directives in the New Testament: A Case Study of John 1:38." *JETS* 50:2 (2007): 275–288.
- Moors, Kent F. "Plato's Use of Dialogue." *CW* 72:2 (1978): 77–93.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . Double check and the references too.
- . *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Morton, A. Q., and J. McLeman. *The Genesis of John*. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew, 1980.
- Moser, Félix. "Mißverständnis und Ironie in der johanneischen Argumentation und ihr Gebrauch in der heutigen pfarramtlichen Praxis." In *Johannes-Studien: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum Johannes-Evangelium; Freundesgabe der Theologischen Fakultät der Uni-*

- versität Neuchâtel für Jean Zumstein, edited by Martin Rose, 47–73. Zurich: Theologischer, 1991.
- Moshavi, Adina. "Can a Positive Rhetorical Question Have a Positive Answer in the Bible?" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 56:2 (2011): 253–273.
- . "Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue." *Biblica* 90 (2009): 32–46.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. With W. F. Howard and Nigel Turner. 4 vols. London: T&T Clark, 1963–1976.
- Moulton, William G. "On the Prosody of Statements, Questions, and Echo Questions." *American Speech* 62:3 (1987): 249–261.
- Müller, Mogens. "Have You Faith in the Son of Man?" (John 9.35)." *NTS* 37:2 (1991): 291–294.
- Murphy, James J., and Richard A. Katula. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*. 3rd ed. With Forbes I. Hill and Donovan J. Ochs. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.
- Nehamas, Alexander. "Eristic, Antilogic, Sophistic, Dialectic: Plato's Demarcation of Philosophy from Sophistry." *HPQ* 7:1 (1990): 3–16.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Jerusalem and Athens: The Congruity of Talmudic and Classical Philosophy*. JSJSup 52. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- , ed. *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. 22 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Neusner, Jacob, and Howard Eilberg-Schwartz. "A Rabbinic Theory of Language?" *JAAR* 56:4 (1988): 762–763.
- Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*. London: United Bible Societies, 1980.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Questions, *Chreiai*, and Challenged to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark's Gospel." *CBQ* 60:4 (1998): 657–681.
- Nicholson, Godfrey C. *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema*. SBLDS 63. Chico: Scholars, 1983.
- Nissen, Johannes, and Sigfred Pedersen, eds. *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel Århus 1997*. JSNTSup 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Noh, Eun-Ju. "Echo Questions: Metarepresentation and Pragmatic Enrichment." *LP* 21:6 (1998): 603–628.
- . *Metarepresentation: A Relevance-Theory Approach*. P&BNS 69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.
- Nuchelmans, Gabriël. *Dilemmatic Arguments: Towards a History of their Logic and Rhetoric*. VKNW 145. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1991.
- Nunn, H. P. V. *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek*. 5th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- O'Banion, John D. "Narration and Argumentation: Quintilian on Narratio as the Heart of Rhetorical Thinking." *Rhetorica* 5:4 (1987): 325–351.
- O'Day, Gail R. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- O'Grady, John F. *Models of Jesus Revisited*. Mahwah: Paulist, 1994.
- Orchard, Helen C. *Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 161. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. FC 80, 89. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1989–1993.
- Palamountain, J. C. "Notes on the Interrogative." *MLJ* 29:2 (1945): 117–126.
- Parret, Herman. "La question et la requête: Vers une théorie anthropologique de l'acte de poser une question." *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 86:3 (1981): 326–346.
- Parsenios, George L. *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*. WUNT 258. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

- Pastorelli, David. *Le Paraclet dans le corpus johannique*. BZNW 142. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Pavey, Emma L. *The Structure of Language: An Introduction to Grammatical Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Peetz, Vera. "Disjunctions and Questions." *Philosophy* 53:204 (1978): 264–269.
- Perkinson, William Howard. "Observations on the Interrogative Sentence in Plautus and Terrence." PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1888. Jeffersonian Republican Book Print.
- Petersen, Norman R. *The Gospel of John and the Sociology of Light: Language and Characterization in the Fourth Gospel*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Petty, Richard E., John T. Cacioppo, and Martin Heesacker. "Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion: A Cognitive Response Analysis." *JPS* 40:3 (1981): 432–440.
- Plato. *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo and Phaedrus*. Translated by Harold North Fowler. LCL 36. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- . *Laches, Protagoras, Meno and Euthydemus*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. LCL 165. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- . *Lysis, Symposium and Gorgias*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. LCL 166. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- . *Meno and Other Dialogues: Charmides, Laches, Lysis, Meno*. Translated and Introduced by Robin Waterfield. OWC. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . *Theaetetus and Sophist*. Translated by Harold North Fowler. LCL 123. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel According to St John: With Maps, Notes and Introduction*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- Poe, Joe Park. "Word and Deed: On 'Stage-Directions' in Greek Tragedy." *Mnemosyne* 56:4 (2003): 420–448.
- Pollock, John L. *Language and Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Poole, Debra A., and Lawrence T. White. "Effects of Question Repetition on the Eyewitness Testimony of Children and Adults." *Developmental Psychology* 27:6 (1991): 975–986.
- Pope, Emily. "Answers to Yes-No Questions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 2:1 (1971): 69–82.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Argument of Romans 5: Can a Rhetorical Question Make a Difference?" *JBL* 110:4 (1991): 655–677.
- . *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- , ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 BC–AD 400)*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Porter, Stanley E., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*. JSNTSup 168. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Pratarelli, Marc E., and Adam Lawson. "Conjunctive Forms and Conditional Inference in Questions and Statements." *NAJP* 3:3 (2001): 415–428.
- Prevot, Laurent, and Laure Vieu. "The Moving Right Frontier." In *Constraints in Discourse*, edited by Anton Benz and Peter Kühnlein, 53–66. P&BNS 172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008.
- Priestly, Joseph. *Socrates and Jesus Compared*. Philadelphia: P. Byrne, 1803.
- Prince, Gerald. "Narrative Analysis and Narratology." *NLH* 13:2 (1982): 179–188.
- Prior, Mary, and Arthur Prior. "Erotetic Logic." *PRev* 64:1 (1955): 43–59.
- Quast, Kevin. *Reading the Gospel of John: An Introduction*. Rev. ed. Mahwah: Paulist, 1996.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by H. E. Butler. 4 vols. LCL 124–127. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920–1921.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Deluxe edition. New York: Longman, 1985.
- Radford, Andrew, Martin Atkinson, David Britain, Harald Clahsen, and Andrew Spencer. *Linguistics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Ram, Ashwin. "A Theory of Questions and Question Asking." *JLS* 1: 3/4 (1991): 273–318.
- Randolph, Charles Brewster. "The Sign of Interrogation in Greek Minusculi Manuscripts." *CP* 5:3 (1910): 309–319.
- Rawlins, Kyle. "(Un)Conditionals: An Investigation in the Syntax and Semantics of Conditional Sentences." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Cruz, 2008. UMI.
- Reese, Brian J. "Bias in Questions." PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2007.
- . "The Meaning and Use of Negative Polar Interrogatives." In *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics: Papers from CSSP 2005*, edited by Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr 6 (2006): 331–354.
- Reich, Keith A. *Figuring Jesus: The Power of Rhetorical Figures of Speech in the Gospel of Luke*. BIS 107. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Reinhartz, Adele. *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John*. New York: Continuum, 2001.
- Renkema, Jan, ed. *Discourse, of Course: An Overview of Research in Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009.
- Rensberger, David. *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- Resseguie, James L. *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John*. BIS 56. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Rexach, Javier Gutiérrez. "Rhetorical Questions, Relevance and Scales." *RAEI* 11 (1998): 139–155.
- Reynolds, Benjamin E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. WUNT 2:249. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Richards, Jennifer. *Rhetoric*. The New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. "Zu den johanneischen ἴνα-Sätzen." *Studia Theologica* 19:1–2 (1965): 213–220.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- Rohde, Hannah. "Rhetorical Questions as Redundant Interrogatives." *San Diego Linguistics Papers* 2 (2006): 134–168.
- Romero, Maribel. "Concealed Questions and Specificational Subjects." *LP* 28:6 (2005): 687–737.
- Romero, Maribel, and Chung-hye Han. "On Negative Yes/No Questions." *LP* 27 (2004): 609–658.
- . "Verum Focus in Negative Yes/No Questions and Ladd's *p* / $\neg p$ Ambiguity." In *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 12, edited by Brendan Jackson, 204–224. Ithaca: CLC, 2002.
- Rooy, Robert van. "Negative Polarity Items in Questions: Strength as Relevance." *Journal of Semantics* 20:3 (2003): 239–273.
- Rooy, Robert van, and Marie Šafářová. "On Polar Questions." In *Proceedings from SALT* 13, edited by Robert B. Young and Yuping Zhou, 292–309. Ithaca: CLC, 2003.
- Rubel, Georg. *Erkenntnis und Bekenntnis: Der Dialog als Weg der Wissensvermittlung im Johannesevangelium*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 54. Münster: Aschendorff, 2009.
- Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Rubinelli, Sara. *Ars Topica: The Classical Technique of Constructing Arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*. AL 15. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009.
- Sacks, Harvey. *Lectures on Conversation*. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. "Hypersentences." PhD diss., University of Illinois, 1969. UMI.

- . "Queclaratives." *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (1971): 223–231.
- Sadock, Jerrold M., and Arnold M. Zwicky. "Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Volume 1, Clause Structure*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 155–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Sanders, Gerald A. "On the Natural Domain of Grammar," in *Indiana Linguistics Reprint* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962), 38–40.
- Sanders, J. N. and B. A. Mastin. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. HaNTC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Sarles, Harvey B. *Language and Human Nature: Toward a Grammar of Interaction and Discourse*. Studies in Semiotics 13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- Schaeffer, Nora Cate, and Stanley Presser. "The Science of Asking Questions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29 (2003): 65–88.
- Schaffer, Deborah. "Can Rhetorical Questions Function as Retorts? Is the Pope Catholic?" *JPrag* 37:4 (2005): 433–460.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks. "Opening Up Closings." *Semiotica* 7 (1973): 289–327.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Johannes: Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1960.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to John*. 3 vols. Translated by Kevin Smyth. New York: Crossroad, 1968–1982.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. *Written That You May Believe: Encountering Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1999.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. THKNT 4. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998.
- Scholtissek, Klaus. "Ironie und Rollenwechsel im Johannesevangelium." *ZNW* 89:3–4 (1998): 235–255.
- Schrott, Angela. "Que fais, Adam? Questions and Seduction in the *Jeu d'Adam*." In *Historical Dialogue Analysis*, edited by Andreas H. Jucker, Gerd Fritz, and Franz Lebsanft, 331–370. P&BNS 66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999.
- Schuhmann, Karl, and Barry Smith. "Questions: An Essay in Daubertian Phenomenology." *PPR* 47:3 (1987): 353–384.
- Scott, Alexander D., and Michael Scott. "The Paradox of the Question." *Analysis* 59:4 (1999): 331–334.
- Scott, Dominic. *Plato's Meno*. CSDP. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Scott, Gary Alan. *Plato's Socrates as Educator*. SUNY Series in Ancient Greek Philosophy. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- , ed. *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato's Dialogues and Beyond*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Searle, John R., and Daniel Vanderveken. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Seaton, R. C. "The Aristotelian Enthymeme." *Classical Review* 28:4 (1914): 113–119.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- , ed. "What is John?" Vol. 1, *Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. SBLSymS 3. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.

- . "What is John?" Vol. 2, *Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. SBLSymS 7. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.
- Seuren, Pieter A. M. *The Logic of Language*. Vol. 2 of *Language from Within*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Shopen, Timothy, ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Sicari, Stephen. *Joyce's Modernist Allegory: Ulysses and the History of the Novel*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Sider, Theodore. "On the Paradox of the Question." *Analysis* 57:2 (1997): 97–101.
- Sidnell, Jack, ed. *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Simons, Herbert W., and Jean G. Jones. *Persuasion in Society*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Simonson, Solomon. "A Definitive Note on the Enthymeme." *AJP* 66:3 (1945): 303–306.
- Simpson, Paul. *Language through Literature: An Introduction*. Interface. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Sinclair, John. *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. Edited with Ronald Carter. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Sinclair, John M., Michael Hoey, and Gwyneth Fox, eds. *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written Discourse*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Singer, Murray. "Stages of Question Answering." *Canadian Psychology* 30:4 (1989): 706–707.
- . "Toward a Model of Question Answering: Yes-No Questions." *JEP: LMC* 10:2 (1984): 285–297.
- Sintonen, Matti. "On the Logic of Why-Questions." *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association* (1984): 168–176.
- Smith, D. Moody. *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- . *John*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- . *John*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- . *John among the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Smith, Robert H. "‘Seeking Jesus’ in the Gospel of John." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 15:1 (1988): 48–55.
- Snow, Richard E. "What Do We Know About Question-Asking?" *ESN* 38:7 (1984): 352–356.
- Sobin, Nicholas. "Echo Questions in the Minimalist Program." *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:1 (2010): 131–148.
- Somerville, James. *The Epistemological Significance of the Interrogative*. ANCTP. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Speyr, Adrienne von. *The Farewell Discourses: Meditations on John 13–17*. Translated by E. A. Nelson. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1987.
- Spranzi, Marta. *The Art of Dialectic between Dialogue and Rhetoric: The Aristotelian Tradition*. Controversies 9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.
- Sproston-North, Wendy E. *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition*. JSNTSup 212. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Stahl, Gerold. "The Effectivity of Questions." *Noûs* 3:2 (1969): 211–218.
- Staley, Jeffrey Lloyd. *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. SBLDS 82. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- Stein, Robert H. *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings*. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Stenning, Keith, Alex Lascarides, and Jo Calder. *Introduction to Cognition and Communication*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.
- Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- . *John as Storyteller*. SNTSMS 73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- . *John's Gospel*. NTR. London: Routledge, 1994.
- , ed. *The Gospel of John as Literature*. NTTS 17. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Stivers, Tanya, and N. J. Enfield. "A Coding Scheme for Question-Response Sequences in Conversation." *JPrag* 42:10 (2010): 2620–2626.
- Strathmann, Hermann. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. NTD 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Stube, John Carlson. *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse*. LNTS 309. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Stump, Eleonore. *Dialectic and Its Place in the Development of Medieval Logic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Suñer, Margarita. "About Indirect Questions and Semi-Questions." *LP* 16:1 (1993): 45–77.
- Swann, William B., Jr., Toni Giuliano, and Daniel M. Wegner. "Where Leading Questions Can Lead: The Power of Conjecture in Social Interaction." *JPSP* 42:6 (1982): 1025–1035.
- Tatham, Mark, and Katherine Morton. *Expression in Speech: Analysis and Synthesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Teller, Paul. "On Why-Questions." *Noûs* 8:4 (1974): 371–380.
- Temple, Dennis. "The Contrast Theory of Why-Questions." *Philosophy of Science* 55:1 (1988): 141–151.
- Thatcher, Tom. *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- . *The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore*. SBLMS 53. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- . *Why John Wrote a Gospel: Jesus—Memory—History*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- , ed. *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Thatcher, Tom, and Stephen D. Moore, eds. *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. SBLRBS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Thielman, Frank. "The Style of the Fourth Gospel and Ancient Literary Critical Concepts of Religious Discourse." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, edited by Duane F. Watson, 169–183. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Tholuck, Augustus. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Charles P. Krauth. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1859.
- Thompson, G. S. *Greek Prose Usage: A Companion to Greek Prose Composition*. London: Macmillan, 1955.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. NTTS 3. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Tichy, Pavel. "Questions, Answers and Logic." *APQ* 15:4 (1978): 275–284.
- Timmerman, David M., and Edward Schiappa. *Classical Greek Rhetorical Theory and the Disciplining of Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Toosarvandani, Maziar. "Association with Foci." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2010.
- . "Wh-movement and the Syntax of Sluicing." *Journal of Linguistics* 44:3 (2008): 677–722.
- Toulmin, Stephen E. *The Uses of Argument*. Upd. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Tovey, Derek. *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 151. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Truswell, Robert. *Events, Phrases, and Questions*. OSTL 33. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- Turnbull, Nick. "Rhetorical Agency as a Property of Questioning." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 37:3 (2004): 207–222.
- Urban, Christina. *Das Menschenbild nach dem Johannesevangelium: Grundlagen johan-neischer Anthropologie*. WUNT 2:137. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Urbanová, Ludmila. "On the Status of Declarative Questions in English Conversation." *Brno Studies in English* 21 (1995): 59–65.
- Uygur, Nermi. "What is a Philosophical Question?" *Mind* 73:289 (1964): 64–83.
- Van der Meij, Hans. "Question Asking: To Know That You Do Not Know Is Not Enough." *JEP* 82:3 (1990): 505–512.
- Vanderverken, Daniel. *Meaning and Speech Acts*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990–1991.
- Vanderveken, Daniel, and Susumu Kubo, eds. *Essays in Speech Act Theory*. P&BNS 77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "Interrogation johannique et exégèse de Cana (John 2,4)." *Biblica* 55:2 (1974): 157–167.
- Varro, Marcus Terentius. *On the Latin Language*. 2 vols. Translated by Roland G. Kent. LCL 333–334. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Vaz, Christopher. "Functional Equivalent Translation of New Testament Hortatory Dis-course into Hill Mada." PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2011.
- Velissaratou, Sophia. "Conditional Questions and Which-Interrogatives." Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2000. ILLC.
- Vickers, Brian. *In Defence of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- Vivian, Bradford. *Being Made Strange: Rhetoric Beyond Representation*. Albany: State Uni-versity of New York Press, 2004.
- Vlastos, Gregory. "The Socratic *Elenchus*." *JPhil* 79:11 (1982): 711–714.
- Vorster, William S. "Op weg na 'n post-kritiese Nuwe-Testamentiese wetenskap." *HTS* 43 (1987): 374–394.
- Wahlde, Urban C. von. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. 3 vols. ECC. Grand Rapids: Eerd-mans, 2010.
- Walker, Jeffrey. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Tes-tament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Walton, Douglas. *Dialog Theory for Critical Argumentation*. Controversies 5. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007.
- . *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Critical Reasoning and Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- . *Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument*. TSP. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- . "New Directions in the Logic of Dialogue." *Synthese* 63:3 (1985): 259–274.
- . *One-Sided Arguments: A Dialectical Analysis of Bias*. SUNY Series in Logic and Lan-guage. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.
- . *Relevance in Argumentation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.
- Wang, Jinjun. "Questions and the Exercise of Power." *Discourse & Society* 17:4 (2006): 529–548.
- Wansbrough, Henry. "The Finale of the Davidic Succession Narrative?" In *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart*, edited by Carmel McCarthy and John F. Healey, 37–56. JSOTSup 375. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Wardy, Robert. *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and their Successors*. Issues in Ancient Philosophy. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Warner, Martin, ed. *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*. Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature. London: Routledge, 1990.

- Wasserman, Ryan, and Dennis Whitcomb. "The Paradox of the Question." *Philosophical Studies* 154:1 (2011): 149–159.
- Watson, Alan. *Jesus and the Jews: The Pharisaic Tradition in John*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- Watson, Duane F. "1 Corinthians 10:23–11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions." *JBL* 108:2 (1989): 301–318.
- Wead, David W. *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970.
- Webb, Ruth. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2009.
- Weber, Elizabeth G. *Varieties of Questions in English Conversation*. SDG 3. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.
- Weigand, Edda. *Dialogue—The Mixed Game*. Dialogue Studies 10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010.
- , ed. *Dialogue and Rhetoric*. Dialogue Studies 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008.
- Wellman, Robert R. "Socratic Method in Xenophon." *JHI* 37:2 (1976): 307–318.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to St John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes*. London: John Murray, 1892.
- Wheatley, J. M. O. "Deliberative Questions." *Analysis* 15:3 (1955): 49–60.
- Whitacre, Rodney A. *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*. SBLDS 67. Chico: Scholars, 1982.
- Widdowson, H. G. *Linguistics*. Oxford Introductions to Language Study. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Wiedemann, Th. "Rhetoric in Polybius." In *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, edited by Herman Verdin, Guido Schepens, and Els de Keyser, 289–300. *Studia Hellenistica* 30. Leuven: Orientaliste, 1990.
- Wilce, James M. *Language and Emotion*. SSCFL 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Wilder, Amos N. *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Wiles, Maurice F. *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Wilson, Deirdre, and Dan Sperber. "Mood and the Analysis of Non-Declarative Sentences." In *Human Agency: Language, Duty, and Value*, edited by Jonathan Dancy, J. M. E. Moravcsik, and C. C. W. Taylor, 77–101. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Wiśniewski, Andrzej. "On the Reducibility of Questions." *Erkenntnis* 40 (1994): 265–284.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- . *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene: Cascade, 2009.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Rev. 4th ed. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- . *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Translated by D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness. Routledge Classics. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. *Divine Discourse: Philosophical Reflections on the Claim that God Speaks*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Wood, Ledger. *The Analysis of Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941.
- Worthington, Ian, ed. *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. BCAW. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- . *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Wright, William M., IV. *Rhetoric and Theology: Figural Reading of John* 9. BZNW 165. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

- Wuellner, Wilhelm H. "Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith." *Semeia* 53 (1991): 113–132.
- Zerwick, Max, and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
- Zillman, Dolf. "Rhetorical Elicitation of Agreement in Persuasion." *JPSP* 21:2 (1972): 159–165.
- Zuber, Richard. *Non-Declarative Sentences*. Pragmatics & Beyond 4:2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abbott, Edwin 65n45, 125n61, 126n66
Ackrill, J. L. 4n13
Adger, David 137n33
Ajdukiewicz, Kazimierz 40
Albrecht, Michael von 26n63
Aloni, Maria 94n50, 118n30, 120n36
Alter, Robert 1n
Anderson, Paul 61n23, 65n50, 166nn7–8, 167n11, 168
Apostel, Leo 40n38
Aquinas, Thomas 140n45
Åqvist, Lennart 39n31
Archer, Dawn 146n5
Aronoff, Mark 38n25
Asher, Nicholas 104n88, 153n30, 157n46, 159n56
Ashton, John 97n63, 127n67
Athanasiadou, Angeliki 87n24
Atkinson, Martin 72n11
Aune, David 24n48
Ausland, Hayden 22n32
- Baker, George 65n46
Bakker, Egbert 64n42
Baltussen, Han 22nn34–35
Bambrough, Renford 123n54
Bandman, Bertram 123n54
Barber, Kimberly 26n62, 63n31, 63n35
Barnes, Jonathan 24n47
Barrett, C. K. 96n61, 101n77, 101n80, 105n92, 126n64, 151n22, 157n43, 166n8, 167
Barsby, John 55n107
Baxter, James 63n33, 138n41
Beasley-Murray, George 79n39, 150n17, 162n68
Bede, Venerable 140n45
Bell, Martin 11n40, 39, 51n91, 88n28, 93n48, 107n102
Belnap, Nuel 3n10, 5n16, 6n21, 7, 10n34, 29nn75–76, 34n6, 39n33, 41, 92n43, 93n48
Benitez, Eugenio 21nn25–26, 21n29
Bennema, Cornelis 96n62, 105n94
Bennett, Michael 44n64
Bernard, J. H. 79n40
Black, C. Clifton 12n43, 61n22
- Blakemore, Diane 71n7, 87n24, 97n66, 107n103
Blankenship, Kevin 54n102, 55n106, 146n4
Blass, Friedrich 64n44, 101n79
Bolinger, Dwight 45n69
Bond, Warwick 143n54
Bonney, William 110n114
Boon, Julian 63n33, 138n41
Borchert, Gerald 2n4
Borgen, Peder 101n77
Borowitz, Eugene 55n108
Boudier, Struyker 4n11
Bourdieu, Pierre 47n77, 53n96
Brant, Jo-Ann 2n3, 60nn10–11, 60n18, 64n39
Britain, David 72n11
Brodie, Thomas 62n24, 86n16, 90n34, 96n62, 109n108
Bromberger, Sylvain 14, 23n43
Brook, Eric 98n72
Brown, Paul 124n56, 124n59, 138n40
Brown, Penelope 41, 43n61
Brown, Raymond 91n35, 101n78, 102n82, 105n92, 151n21
Brueggemann, Walter 16n
Buch-Hansen, Gitte 94n52, 136n27
Bühlmann, Walter 101n77
Buijs, Michel 104n87
Bultmann, Rudolf 79n42, 86n17, 117n24, 136n29, 151nn21–22, 164n2
Burger, Ronna 4n11
Burkett, Delbert 100n75, 101n78, 102n81, 151n21
Burton, Ernest 124n58
Butler, Alastair 94n50
Butler, Paul 55n105, 62n29, 65n48
- Cacioppo, John 55n106
Cadbury, Henry 2n5
Cain, Rebecca 19n17
Calder, Jo 47n77
Callender, Aimee 11n40
Calvin, John 105n92, 110n13, 136n27, 143n54, 156n36
Canetti, Elias 62n30
Carawan, E. M. 21n28

- Carlson, Lauri 33n2, 46n74, 54m101,
 64n40, 115n13, 158n48
 Carroll, Noël 6n20
 Carson, D. A. 78n38, 87n20, 95n53,
 101n80, 105n92, 117n24, 122n47, 140n44,
 162n67
 Caton, Charles 132n10
 Cheung, Yam-Leung 72n12
 Chiles, Tina 73n16
 Cho, Sukmin 152n23
 Clahsen, Harald 72n11
 Clark, Robin 84n12
 Clark-Soles, Jaime 110n115
 Clarke, M. L. 26n63, 55n106
 Clayman, Steven 29n78, 54n100, 61n19,
 87n25, 98n68, 104n88, 115n14, 135n24,
 153n29, 158n48
 Collingwood, R. G. 6n20
 Collins, Raymond 91n37, 105n94, 106n96,
 143n52
 Combs, Blinn 120n39
 Comfort, Philip 8n28, 151n21, 161n63
 Conley, Thomas 24n48
 Connolly, Joy 26n57
 Coolidge, Frederick 71n9
 Cooper, Alan 16n
 Coste, Didier 10n34, 10n37
 Coulthard, Malcolm 145n1
 Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth 48n80, 48n83
 Craig, Kenneth, Jr. 16n, 17n7, 54n102
 Craig, Traci 54n102, 55n106, 146n4
 Crosswhite, James 62n30, 63
 Cruse, D. A. 115n14, 159n53
 Crystal, David 9n31, 35n14, 37n23, 40
 Culpepper, Alan 102n82, 105n93, 136n30,
 164, 168n18
 Cushman, Marlene 34n5, 47n77

 Dancygier, Barbara 93n46
 Daubert, Johannes 34, 42
 Davidson, Donald 35nn10–11
 Davies, Margaret 62n27, 78n36, 136n30,
 156n36, 166n7
 De Boer, Martinus 101n77
 De Man, Paul 50n90, 51n91, 54n103,
 133n15
 De Sacy, Antoine 118n27
 DeBrunner, A. 101n79
 Dekker, Paul 94n50
 Deman, Thomas 58n3
 Devine, A. M. 38n24, 48nn80–81, 136n31
 Diel, Paul 101n78
 Dik, Helma 84n7, 137n34
 Dillon, J. T. 3n8, 103n86

 Dodd, C. H. 126n64, 126n66
 Domeris, W. R. 59n9, 60n18
 Dorion, Louis-André 22n32
 Doyle, Charles 141nn49–50, 143nn53–54
 Duke, Paul 48n84, 54n104, 58n3, 63n32,
 90n34, 122n48, 136n30, 139n42, 140n44,
 167n14, 168
 Dumm, Demetrius 86n19, 105n93, 151n21
 Dunderberg, Ismo 78n34, 156n36

 Edelman, Samuel 17n7, 18n10, 62n28
 Edwards, Mark 118n27
 Eemeren, Frans van 39n31, 67n59, 70n6,
 147n10
 Égré, Paul 118n30, 120n36
 Ehrlich, Susan 35n7
 Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard 18n9
 Eire, López 54n102
 Ellis, Peter 135n25, 140n46, 151n22
 Elmer, Herbert 125n60
 Enfield, N. J. 52n93, 119n32
 Engdahl, Elisabet 73n16
 Enzle, Michael 146n3
 Estes, Douglas 10n35, 73n18, 77n32,
 84n12, 105n91, 116n22, 150n16, 156n39,
 170n28

 Fahnestock, Jeanne 10n36, 51n91, 54n102,
 55n106, 63n31, 64n38, 146n6, 147n9,
 166n7
 Fales, Walter 29n73, 29n76, 46n72,
 47n76, 60n12, 112n2
 Fantham, Elaine 26n61
 Farely, Nicolas 105n92
 Fava, Elisabetta 40n36
 Fiengo, Robert 37n21, 41, 43n59,
 46nn72–73, 47n77, 51n92, 69n3, 70n5,
 113nn3–4, 116n17
 Fischer, David 98n70
 Floricic, Franck 83n6, 145n2
 Forestall, Terence 78n36, 79n42
 Fortenbaugh, W. W. 23n42
 Fox, Margalit 9n32
 Frank, David 19n17
 Frank, Jane 51n91
 Freed, Alice 35n7
 Frege, Gottlob 27–28, 30, 39, 43

 Gadamer, Hans-Georg 6n20
 Gagarin, Michael 25n55
 Gangel, Kenneth 90n34, 143n52
 Gaskin, Richard 5n14
 Gauker, Christopher 35n11
 Geis, Michael 35n8

- Genette, Gérard 66n52, 112n1
 Gibson, Craig 24n49, 25n50
 Ginzburg, Jonathan 10n34, 29n75, 39n33, 115n12
 Glasson, T. F. 75n27
 Goodwin, William 123n52
 Gordis, Robert 17n6, 121n41, 153n29, 154n33
 Graesser, Arthur 11n40
 Greenbaum, Sidney 40n35
 Groenendijk, Jeroen 4n10, 5n19, 11n39, 28n70, 29n73, 29n74, 34nn4–5, 36n15, 39nn32–33, 42n51, 42n54, 43n58, 46n73, 47n78, 51n91, 54n101
 Grootendorst, Rob 39n31, 67n59, 70n6, 147n10
 Grosvenor, Mary 126n63, 156n40
 Gruber, Helmet 12n44, 62n30, 131n5, 132n11, 133nn16–17
 Guerzoni, Elena 159n52
 Gunlogson, Christine 153n28
- Haenchen, Ernst 95n53, 136n27, 151n21, 156n36
 Hakola, Raimo 74n20, 117n23
 Halonen, Ilpo 47n77, 98n70, 104n87
 Hamblin, Charles 10n34, 39n33, 40
 Hamm, Jim 61n22
 Han, Chung-hye 9n29, 29n74, 50n87, 54n101, 55n108, 56n109, 69n4, 126n63, 153n30, 154n32, 158n49, 159n55
 Hanson, Anthony 126n64, 127n67
 Harnish, Robert 29n75, 30n83, 41
 Harrah, David 29n72, 33n1, 33n3, 34n5, 37n18, 39, 42nn50–51, 72n14
 Harvey, Michael 146n3
 Hawley, Wendell 151n21, 161n63
 Hayes, Christine 18n8
 Heath, Malcolm 25nn55–56
 Heesacker, Martin 55n106
 Heim, Irene 159n52
 Heinemann, Trine 115n10, 154n35, 159n54
 Hemingway, Ernest 144
 Henderson, G. P. 29n76, 61n19
 Henkemans, Francisca 67n59, 70n6, 147n10
 Heritage, John 29n78, 54n100, 61n19, 87n25, 98n68, 104n88, 115n14, 135n24, 153n29, 158n48
 Herrick, James 26n61
 Hidary, Richard 19n15, 19n17
 Higginbotham, James 31n85, 34n4, 41, 43n57, 46n75, 72n15, 84n8, 115n11
- Hintikka, Jaakko 39n31, 47n77, 98n70, 104n87
 Hiz, Henry 23n43
 Hobbes, Thomas 5
 Hoffman, Kathryn 53n97, 59n6, 63n31
 Hoffman, Mark 53n97, 59n6, 63n31
 Holmes, Janet 73n16
 Hookway, Christopher 3n10, 6n20, 39n33, 43n56
 Hoskyns, Edwyn 156n36
 Howland, Jacob 19n16, 167n12
 Huddleston, Rodney 29n72, 44n63, 71n10
 Hudson, Richard 28n69, 42n51, 43n56, 47n77, 51n91, 115n10, 116n16, 154n31
 Huntington, Henry 65n46
 Husserl, Edmund 5, 32n87, 42n49
 Hutchby, Ian 132n12
 Hyman, Ronald 129n3
- Ilie, Cornelia 51n91, 54n101
 Isaacs, James 91n39, 92n42, 115n11
 Iwata, Seizi 137n32
- Jacobs, Louis 18n8, 19n12
 Janicki, Karol 71n8
 Jauss, Hans Robert 5n14, 26n62, 30n83, 58n2, 60n11, 63n35, 82n4
 Jeffreys, Harold 39
 Jespersen, Otto 47n77
 Johnson, Alison 145n1
 Johnson, Janet 60n10
 Johnston, George 102n82
 Johnstone, Barbara 73n17
 Jones, Jean 93n49
 Joseph, Brian 124n56, 124n59, 138n40
 Joyce, James 58
- Kahn, Charles 21n25, 21n29, 22n32, 22n35, 65n44, 88n27
 Kanagaraj, Jey 103n82
 Kant, Immanuel 97n65
 Karttunen, Lauri 36n16, 39, 44n64, 45n69, 71n7, 81n1, 118n30
 Keener, Craig 78n38
 Kekes, John 43n55
 Kelly, David 4n12
 Kennedy, George 15n4, 21n28, 23nn41–42, 25nn51–52, 26n57, 54n102, 61nn21–22, 62n24, 120n38, 123n50, 168, 171
 Kerferd, George 22n32
 Kerr, Alan 89n30, 101n77
 Kevelson, Roberta 6n20
 Kierkegaard, Søren 49n86
 Kleiner, Scott 30n81, 46n72, 150n18

- Klink, Edward 171n33
 Knight, Thomas 41n41
 Korta, Kepa 88n29
 Koshik, Irene 51n91, 52n93, 72n10, 120n37
 Köstenberger, Andreas 91n35, 101n77,
 105n92, 109n109, 110n113, 140n46, 156n38
 Kraus, Manfred 55n106, 147n8
 Kubinski, Tadeusz 42n53
 Kuntz, Kenneth 51n91
 Kysar, Robert 136n27
- Labahn, Michael 139n43
 Ladd, Robert 43n60
 Ladusaw, William 159n52
 Lamari, Anna 104n87
 Lang, Kathy 11n40
 Lanham, Richard 21n26
 Lascarides, Alex 47n77, 104n88
 Lausberg, Heinrich 26nn59–60
 Lawler, John 159n52
 Lawson, Adam 122n46, 134n20
 Lecercle, Jean-Jacques 147n7
 Leclerc, André 33n2
 Lee-Goldman, Russell 51n91, 52n93,
 54n101
 Leech, Geoffrey 40n35
 Leonardi, Paolo 42n53, 67n58, 92n41,
 94n51, 131n6
 Lepore, Ernest 66n53
 Levinson, Stephen 41, 43n61
 Lewis, David 36n16
 Liddicoat, Anthony 12n46, 32n89, 47n77,
 47n79, 115n14, 131n7
 Lieberman, Saul 19n14
 Liew, Tat-siong 90n34
 Lightfoot, David 125n62, 126n63
 Lincoln, Andrew 74n20, 78n36, 87n22,
 101n77, 105n92, 105n94, 117n26, 123n51,
 135n25, 152n25, 157n42, 157n44
 Lindars, Barnabas 78n36, 162n68
 Ling, Timothy 156n38
 Litwack, Eugene 69n2, 116n15, 158n51,
 159n57
 Liu, Yameng 25n56
 Llewelyn, John 39n33
 Louw, Johannes 106n97, 142n
 Ludwig, Kirk 66n53
 Luther, Martin 65n50, 99n75
 Lyons, John 9n30, 35n11, 41, 60n12, 114n8
 Lyotard, Jean-François 6n20
- MacGregor, G. H. C. 110n112
 Mack, Burton 169–70
 Mack, Peter 107n101
- Makkai, Adam 114n6
 Marley, Charles 63n33, 138n41
 Mastin, B. A. 140n47
 Mastronarde, Donald 61n20, 65n47,
 66n54, 66n56, 124n55, 167n14
 Mayo, Bernard 29n73
 Mayr, Andrea 35n11
 Mburu, Elizabeth 78n36
 McCaffrey, James 60n14, 64n39, 140n44
 McClymond, Michael 58n3
 McCoy, Marina 4n11, 22n31
 McDaniel, Mark 11n40
 McGrath, James 96n62, 99n75
 McHugh, John 105n93
 McKay, Kenneth 8n26, 64n44, 124n58,
 126n63, 161n64
 McLeman, J. 62n27
 McWhorter, Ashton 125n62
 Meeks, Wayne 75n27
 Metzger, Bruce 8n24, 8nn26–27
 Mey, Jacob 30n81, 88n29
 Meyer, Michel 5n14, 22n30, 22n33, 22n36,
 23n39, 34n5, 47n77, 163n
 Meyer, Ronald 47n79
 Mielziner, Moses 19n13
 Mignini, Marta 54n102
 Millikan, Ruth 35n11
 Minchin, Elizabeth 10n36, 73n16, 100n76,
 120n35, 120n37, 158n50
 Mirhady, David 21nn27–28
 Mishler, Elliot 118n28
 Miyake, Naomi 46n72
 Mleinek, Ina 47n79
 Moloney, Francis 78n38, 91n35, 99n75,
 101n78, 103n84
 Montefusco, Lucia 120n39
 Monzoni, Chiara 47n79
 Moors, Kent 60n15
 Morris, Leon 79n42, 87n21, 95n57, 126n65
 Morton, A. Q. 62n27
 Morton, Katherine 64n43, 114n6
 Moser, Félix 136n30
 Moshavi, Adina 16n
 Moulton, James 8n24, 8n27
 Moulton, William 34n5, 49n85
- Nehemas, Alexander 22n29
 Neusner, Jacob 18n9, 19n16
 Newman, Barclay 8n26, 101n78, 102n82,
 110n13, 135n23
 Nicholson, Godfrey 95n54, 101n77,
 136n29
 Nida, Eugene 8n26, 101n78, 102n82,
 106n97, 110n13, 135n23, 142n

- Noh, Eun-Ju 53n98, 136n31, 137n32,
137n38, 138n39
Norman, Donald 46n72
Nunn, H. P. V. 8n26
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg 72n13
O'Grady, John 58n3
- Painter, John 1n, 105n94
Parsenios, George 61n22
Pastorelli, David 78n38
Pavey, Emma 114n6
Perry, John 88n29
Petty, Richard 55n106
Plummer, Alfred 87n21, 101n77, 127n68,
151n22
Poe, Joe Park 60n10
Pollock, John 83n6
Poole, Debra 169n23
Pratarelli, Marc 122n46, 134n20
Priestly, Joseph 58n3
Prince, Gerald 10n35
Prior, Arthur 46n75, 47n77, 72n15, 92n40,
92n42, 118n30
Prior, Mary 46n75, 47n77, 72n15, 92n40,
92n42, 118n30
- Quast, Kevin 101n80
Quirk, Randolph 40n35
- Radford, Andrew 72n11
Ram, Ashwin 3n8, 60n18, 82n3
Randolph, Charles 8nn27–28
Rawlins, Kyle 91n39, 92n42, 93n45, 115n11
Rees-Miller, Janie 38n25
Reese, Brian 51n91, 153n28, 153n30,
154n32, 157n46, 159n56
Reid, Thomas 3n10
Reinhart, Adele 89n31
Rensberger, David 95n57
Rexach, Javier 154n34, 159nn54–55
Reynolds, Benjamin 151n21
Richards, Jennifer 27n67
Ridderbos, Herman 48n84, 140n45,
151n22, 161n62
Riesenfeld, Harald 170n31
Riley, Denise 147n7
Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith 10n35
Roberts, Richard 11n40
Robertson, A. T. 8n28, 64n44
Romero, Maribel 153n30, 154n32
Rooy, Robert van 153n28–29
Rossano, Federico 41, 43n61
Rubenstein, Jeffrey 18n11
- Rubinelli, Sara 22n32
Ryle, Gilbert 32n87, 42n49
- Sabbe, M. 89n30
Sacks, Harvey 32n89, 131n7
Sadock, Jerry 115n10, 138n39, 138n40
Safářová, Marie 153nn28–29
Sanders, Gerald 29n77
Sanders, J. N. 140n47
Santambrogio, Marco 42n53, 67n58,
92n41, 94n51, 131n6
Sarangi, Srikant 82n4, 98n74, 104n89
Sarles, Harvey 14n1, 29n71, 71n8, 129n2
Schegloff, Emanuel 32n89
Schenke, Ludger 100n75, 103n84
Scherer, Karl 101n77
Schiappa, Edward 20n18, 22n35, 61n22
Schnackenburg, Rudolf 78n36, 86n17,
102n81, 103n83, 105n92, 110n14, 126n64,
136n27, 151nn21–22, 156n41, 162n68
Schneiders, Sandra 63n32, 65n50, 86n18,
87n22
Schnelle, Udo 65n50, 90n32
Scholtissek, Klaus 136n30
Schrott, Angela 147n11
Schuhmann, Karl 23n40, 32n88, 34n4,
39n33, 42
Scott, Dominic 21n22
Scott, Gary 20n21, 21nn23–24, 21n26,
22n34
Searle, John 39n33, 41, 87n25, 91n38,
114n6, 115n12, 134n18, 147n11
Secor, Marie 10n36, 54n102, 55n106,
63n31, 64n38, 146n6, 147n9, 166n7
Segovia, Fernando 65n50, 78n36
Selting, Margret 48n80, 48n83
Seuren, Pieter 3n8, 29n71
Shakespeare, William 144, 156n39
Sharvit, Yael 159n52
Sicari, Stephen 58n2
Sider, Theodore 29n76
Simons, Herbert 93n49
Simpson, Paul 35n11, 133n14
Sinclair, John 35n11, 135n24, 164n4
Singer, Murray 43n59
Sintonen, Matti 98n71
Smith, Barry 23n40, 32n88, 34n4, 39n33, 42
Smith, Carlota 10n35
Smith, Moody 89n30, 150n17, 164n3
Smith, Robert 2n1
Smith, Robin 3n7
Snow, Richard 46n72, 60n13
Sobin, Nicholas 137n35
Solotareff, Jeannine 101n78

- Somerville, James 3n10, 10n34, 10n36,
27n68, 29n76, 30n80, 30n82, 32n88,
33n1, 35n11, 37n22, 39n33, 40n34, 42n49,
42n51, 45n69, 62n30, 115n10, 129n3
- Spencer, Andrew 72n11
- Sperber, Dan 35n11, 41, 97n66, 107n102,
116n17, 119n31
- Speyr, Adrienne von 139n42
- Spranzi, Marta 166n6, 166n9
- Stahl, Gerold 29n73, 40
- Stamps, Dennis 62n24
- Steel, Thomas 29n76, 34n6, 41
- Stein, Robert 58n3, 59n7, 60n16, 132n13,
136n28
- Stenning, Keith 47n77
- Stenström, Anna-Brita 129n2
- Stephens, Laurence 38n24, 48nn80–81,
136n31
- Stibbe, Mark 105n92, 126n64, 167–68
- Stivers, Tanya 52n93, 119n32
- Stokhof, Martin 4n10, 5n19, 11n39,
28n70, 29n73, 29n74, 34nn4–5, 36n15,
39nn32–33, 42n51, 42n54, 43n58, 46n73,
47n78, 51n91, 54n101
- Strathmann, Hermann 117n26
- Stump, Eleonore 166
- Suñer, Margarita 36n17
- Svartvik, Jan 40n35
- Tatham, Mark 64n43, 114n6
- Thatcher, Tom 67n57, 143n54, 168,
170n31, 171n32
- Tholuck, Augustus 167n15
- Tichy, Pavel 35n12, 64n41
- Timmerman, David 20n18, 22n35
- Toosarvandani, Maziar 75n30
- Truswell, Robert 115n14
- Tsui, Amy 153n29
- Turnbull, Nick 6n20, 167n13
- Ultan, Russell 48n80
- Urbanová, Ludmila 37n19, 47n77
- Uygur, Nermi 97n67
- Vanderveken, Daniel 39n33, 41, 91n38,
114n6, 115n12, 134n18, 147n11
- Vaz, Christopher 153n30
- Vickers, Brian 54n103
- Vivian, Bradford 65n48
- Vlastos, Gregory 22n32
- Vorster, William 62n27
- Wahlde, Urban von 79n41, 101n78,
136n28, 161n63
- Wallace, Rex 124n56, 124n59, 138n40
- Walton, Douglas 12n45, 22n32, 29n72,
34n5, 60n12, 63n34, 66n55, 113n4, 115n11,
116n19, 147n11, 148n12, 157n47, 159n54,
159n57
- Wang, Jinjun 12nn45–46, 62n30, 72n13,
75n25, 116n18, 130
- Wansbrough, Henry 63n31
- Wardy, Robert 168n21
- Waterfield, Robin 167n13
- Webb, Ruth 26n57
- Weigand, Edda 115n12, 118n30
- Wellman, Robert 20n20, 110n11
- Westcott, B. F. 101n78, 101n80, 136n28,
140n45, 151n22, 161n62
- Wheatley, J. M. O. 123n54, 124nn57–58
- Whitacre, Rodney 105n95
- White, Lawrence 169n23
- Whitmarsh, T. J. G. 167n13
- Widdowson, H. G. 30n81
- Wiedemann, Th. 61n23
- Wilce, James 106n98
- Wilder, Amos 61n22, 169n24
- Wiles, Maurice 58n5
- Wilson, Deirdre 35n11, 41, 97n66, 107n102,
116n17, 119n31
- Witherington, Ben, III 1n, 15n4, 19n14,
62n26, 105n92, 118n27, 152n25, 170n31
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig 6n22, 29n78, 39n33
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas 129n3
- Wood, Ledger 29n76
- Wootton, Anthony 35n8
- Wuellner, Wilhelm 62n24
- Wynn, Thomas 71n9
- Yamanashi, Masa-aki 65n49
- Zerwick, Max 126n63, 156n40
- Zillman, Dolf 62n29, 167n13
- Zuber, Richard 30n79, 84n11
- Zwaan, Rolf 43n59
- Zwicky, Arnold 115n10

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- agnoetic question 67n57
- alethic logic 11n38, 11n41, 33. *See also* propositional logic
- alternative question 44–45, 70, 76, 100–101, 118–23
- ambiguity 9, 54, 70, 74n21, 78–79, 84
- ambiguous question 84
- Anaximenes of Lampsacus 25
- answers 4, 11n41, 21–23, 28–31, 65, 131
- answers, 'true' 29–31
- anthyphophora* 107. *See also* expository question
- Antiphon from Rhamnous 25
- apodosis 95–96, 101–102
- aposiopesis* 100–102
- Aristophanes 25
- Aristotle 4–5, 9, 11n41, 19–20, 21n22, 23–25, 27, 30, 45n66, 48–49, 58, 116, 166n6, 168n22
- artificial discourse 57, 87, 116
- assertion 3n7, 5n17, 19, 39, 54–55, 96, 133, 140, 146, 153n30, 163, 167. *See also* proposition
- assumptions 8, 15, 32, 35n11, 55n108, 59, 63, 70, 74, 78–79, 106n98, 108n104, 125, 131n8, 147–48, 150–51, 156n39, 163, 168n22, 170
- Augustine 26n62, 58
- bias, against questions 3, 7, 33, 79
- bias, in questions 55, 70n5, 74n21, 75, 78, 90, 115–17, 119, 121, 131, 134, 143, 146, 148, 153–54, 157–60
- biased question 47, 145n1, 147, 157–62
- binary logic 33, 50, 52
- Boethius 5
- Bromberger, Sylvain 14
- Bugbears* 143n54
- Caiaphus 121
- Carnap, Rudolf 28
- causa* 26
- causal question 92–93, 96
- Chariton 25
- choice question 113. *See also* polar question
- chorus 49, 60
- Chrysippus 3, 172
- Cicero, Marcus 25–27
- cleft construction 38
- Codex Sinaiticus 8n28
- coercive question 145–62
- Cohen, Felix 28
- comparativa* 26
- conditional question 45–47, 82, 91–97, 148
- confirmation question 46, 113, 118. *See also* polar question
- coniuncta* 26
- conjunctive 134
- conjunctive question 45
- constituent interrogative 35n13. *See also* indirect question
- conversation 12, 17, 28, 32, 38, 43, 49, 53, 72, 83, 94–97, 98n69, 99, 106, 120, 126, 128, 130, 132, 136, 138–39, 143, 159, 161
- conversation analysis 32–33, 54n100, 128n1, 131n8, 133
- counterfactual question 67n57, 92, 93n44, 96
- course question 82, 95
- cross-examination 22
- cue, interrogative *See* tell, interrogative
- Cyril of Alexandria 58, 60n12
- Daubert, Johannes 34, 42
- decisive question 111–28, 145, 153–54, 158
- declaration 3n7, 7–8, 27, 48, 66, 74, 79, 86–87, 126, 139. *See also* proposition
- declarative 5n17, 31nn84–85, 33n3, 35–36, 39, 44, 47, 54n101, 60, 64n44, 65n49, 66, 73, 74n22, 77, 95, 100, 109, 114, 121n40, 125–26, 131, 134n21, 135, 136n30, 139n42, 153n30, 161
- declarative question 45, 49, 114n7, 115n9, 137n37
- definite article 84
- deliberative question 47, 113, 123–27
- Demades 62
- Demosthenes 47n77, 123n50
- Derveni Papyrus 8n27
- dialectic 20, 23, 45n66, 116, 166–69, 171
- dialogue 1, 17, 22, 31, 49, 53, 59–60, 63, 65, 67, 76–77, 85, 102, 108, 124, 128, 130–33, 141, 149n15, 163, 166–67, 169, 171

- dilemma 120, 122, 147
 direct question 8n25, 35–36, 65, 119
 disjunctive 119, 122n44
 divinity of Jesus 58, 91
 double-bind 147, 151, 152n26
 dual question 100n76
- echo question 49, 76, 84, 131–32, 136–40
 EGH principle 67n59, 147
elenchus 22
 embedded interrogative 35n13. *See also*
 indirect question
- English 11, 35, 38, 44n62, 45n68,
 50nn88–89, 54n103, 65n49, 70n5, 71–72,
 75n24, 76, 78n35, 81–82, 89n22, 91, 93,
 100–102, 106, 108, 113–15, 119, 124, 125n62,
 137n35, 143, 147, 154, 156n39, 158, 159n52
enthymeme 24
 epistemic supremacy, Jesus' 75n28, 88,
 89n30, 90n33, 117n25
 epistemic verb 36, 119n33
eros 4
 erotetic theory 11n41, 16, 36n16, 87n23,
 134n18, 161n65
 erotetician 23n43, 37, 49n87, 52n94,
 54n101, 84n11, 97, 112, 122n44, 123, 131n5,
 140n48, 153n29, 159n52
 Euripides 25
 exam question 87n23. *See also* test
 question
- exclamative 44, 74, 102n81, 125, 126n66,
 131n8, 133, 134n19, 138–39, 156n37
 expository question 82–83, 107–10, 149n15
 extra variable echo question 137–38
 Ezekiel 151n19
- face-threatening device 133
 fallacy 148n13
 Farewell Discourse 59
 Favorinus 22
 first words 1–2, 164
 focus-shifting question 132n9
 Frege, Gottlob 27–28, 30, 39, 43
 fronting 137n35
- Gethsemane 127
 Greek 8n27, 15–16, 19–21, 37–38, 44n62,
 61–62, 64–65, 72, 75, 78n35, 92, 100–102,
 106, 108, 114–15, 119, 124, 126n63, 128n1,
 134, 154, 160n58
 guess question 87n24
- Hebrew 16, 121n41
 Hermagoras of Temnos 25–26
- Hermogenes of Tarsus 25, 123n50
 historiography 55n108, 57, 61
 homoioteleuton 77n33
 how 72, 94, 104, 133–35, 146, 164
 how question 50, 94–97, 104
 humanity of Jesus 91, 126–27
hypophora 107. *See also* expository
 question
- hypothesis* 26
 hypothetical question 97, 150. *See also*
 speculative question
- imperative 33n3, 44, 112n1, 156n37
 inapposite question 88
 indexical 79n39, 83–86, 132, 134, 138,
 150–52
 indexical question 82–88, 98, 137n36, 161
 indirect question 35–36, 67n57, 72, 119
 inquiry question 103. *See also* sequence
 question
- insiders 110, 170–71
 institutional discourse 3n8, 88, 90, 116,
 118
interrogatio 26
 interrogation 3n8, 19, 22n32, 26n62, 121,
 122n48, 148–49, 151, 171
 interrogativity 35n11, 36–38, 43–44, 48,
 95n55, 113
 interrogative 3n7, 27, 31n85, 32–35, 36n17,
 37–38, 44, 46–47, 50, 53, 54n101, 55, 64,
 65n49, 66, 67n57, 67n59, 72, 102, 104n90,
 131n7, 134–35, 136n30, 156n37
 interrogative pressure 90, 121n42, 130,
 138, 146–47
 intonation 37, 47–48
 irony 54, 59, 63n32, 86, 122n48, 136, 140,
 168, 171
- Joyce, James 58
 Judean 18, 20, 73, 77, 94, 109, 120–23, 125,
 133, 142–43
- Lazarus 85, 142–43, 155, 157
 leading question 116, 145. *See also*
 coercive question
- Letter to Diognetus* 25
 loaded question 147–52, 157, 163–64
 logic 9n33, 11, 28, 42, 66, 92–93, 117
 logic, erotetic 11n38, 13, 28, 33, 51, 66, 115,
 117, 134, 150n18, 170
 logic, modern 3n7, 5–6, 11n38, 11n41,
 27–28, 33, 39, 41–42, 44–45, 47, 122n44
 Longinus 25, 108
 lyric question 67n57

- Martha 2n2, 63n36, 85–87, 155–57
 Mary 85, 142, 155
 Meno's paradox 20–21, 46
 modal logic 11n38, 33
 monologue 11, 49, 73–74, 94, 110, 135
 mood 35, 37, 41
 morphology 38

 naïve audience 94
 naked proposition 5, 7, 9, 11
 narrative 1–2, 10–11, 17, 23–25, 32, 49,
 53–63, 65, 79, 82, 93, 113–14, 128n1, 129,
 156n39, 163–64, 166, 168–69, 170n29
 natural discourse 28–30, 37, 46, 49–51,
 54n100, 57, 64, 69n2, 76–77, 83n6, 87,
 88n26, 93, 97–98, 101–102, 111–13, 115, 118,
 122n44, 128n1, 129, 132–33, 137, 139–41,
 143, 144n55, 146–48, 159, 170n29
 negative particle 152, 154
 negative polar interrogative *See* negative
 polar question
 negative polar item 69, 74, 126, 134, 152,
 153n27, 159n52, 160n59, 161
 negative polar question 53n96, 74, 114n5,
 134, 142, 147, 152–58
 negative polarizer *See* negative polar
 item
 Nicodemus 2n2, 48, 63n36, 94–97,
 133–36
 nonsensical question 132
 NPI *See* negative polar item; negative
 polar question

 object-pronoun transformation 38
 open question 46, 69–82, 92, 103, 106,
 111–12, 119n34, 128, 135, 137, 145
 opposing-turn question 49, 76, 100, 107,
 122–23, 131–36, 139, 141, 143
 oratory 4, 17–18, 25–27, 55, 75n23
 outsiders 110, 170–71

 particle, interrogative 37–38, 78n35, 83,
 113
 particle, negative 152, 154
pathos 26
 pejorative language 91, 159
percontatio 107. *See also* expository
 question
Pericope Adulterae 160–62
 persuasive discourse 105, 147, 149, 157,
 164, 166, 168–69
 Peter 2n2, 63n36, 121, 125–26, 138–40
 Pharisees 77, 89, 91, 94, 149, 151, 160
 phatic question 50n89, 67n57, 106n98

 philosophical question 97. *See also*
 speculative question
 phonetics 38
 phonology 38
 Pilate 2n2, 63n36, 121–23
 Plato 4, 5n14, 21–24, 27, 58, 100n76, 130,
 167, 172
 Plutarch 25
 polar question 23, 26n62, 44–45, 64n44,
 77, 81, 86, 92, 95, 101, 103, 107, 113–19,
 121–22, 126, 134, 138–39, 141, 143, 147,
 152–53, 155, 158, 161–62, 167n10. *See also*
 negative polar question; positive polar
 question
 polarity 55, 70, 72, 76, 82, 98, 113–15,
 117, 119–20, 124–25, 134, 145, 150, 152–53,
 161
 positive-negative conjuncted clause 38
 positive polar question 100, 117, 118n28,
 121, 150–51, 153–54. *See also* polar
 question
 possible worlds 29, 31, 47
 power 62–63, 88, 90, 118, 131n7, 146
 pragmatics 28, 30–32, 35n9, 36, 38,
 40–44, 45n70, 47–49, 52, 53n99, 55,
 64–65, 70, 72n13, 87n23, 104, 106n99,
 108n104, 109, 111, 112n1, 113–14, 116, 121n42,
 122n44, 130–31, 137n36, 141, 145, 148, 154,
 159, 160n58
 prayer 4, 89, 127
progymnasmata 11, 15, 24
 proposition 2–12, 23, 24n48, 29–31, 33,
 39–40, 52, 58, 60, 62–63, 66, 79, 94n52,
 95, 100, 121, 134n19, 142, 159, 163, 171
 propositional logic 5, 33, 11n38
 prosody 9, 37–38, 47–49, 50n89, 64, 70,
 108, 114n8
 protagonist 111, 58, 98, 105, 123, 133, 155
 Protagoras 4, 9, 20
 protasis 81, 91–93, 95–96, 100–101
 pseudo-questions 112n1
 punctuation 7–9, 19, 25, 35–37, 47–49, 64

quaestio finita 26
quaestio infinita 26, 97
 qualities of questions
 assertive 54, 153n30
 bias 70n5, 78, 90, 115, 117, 131, 146, 157–62
 coercive 146–47, 154
 decisive 53, 86, 111–14, 116, 121, 150n17,
 151n22
 informational 32, 49–53, 55, 56n110,
 67, 69, 71–72, 74, 76, 78, 88, 90,
 95–96, 100, 106, 109, 111, 115, 119–20,

- 122, 126, 135, 139, 140n48, 142, 150, 156,
159, 161
- leading 63n33, 111, 147
- mild force *See* weak force
- omnidirectional 88, 98, 104, 138,
171n32
- open 45n68, 53, 69–71, 73, 76–77, 83,
90, 112, 119n33
- persuasive 12, 18, 62, 69–70, 73, 75, 77,
82, 86, 87n22, 96n60, 107–10, 114n5,
118, 119n34, 128–29, 137–38, 145, 152,
154–57, 159, 160n60, 167–69
- reflective 82–83, 90, 108–9
- responsive 130–31
- revelational 52n95
- 'rhetorical' 13, 17, 26–27, 31–32, 34–35,
49–56, 58–59, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73–78,
82, 85, 87–88, 90, 95–96, 100, 102, 104,
106–8, 110n10, 111–12, 115, 120, 121n41,
122, 125–26, 135, 139, 141–42, 147, 150,
153n30, 154, 156, 159, 168
- speculative 98–99, 150
- strong force 121n42, 122n45, 138, 151,
152n27, 154, 159n52
- testing 75n28, 88, 89n30, 90n33,
117n25, 150
- unidirectional 138
- weak force 71, 121n42, 138, 152n27, 154,
159n52
- quantifier question 67n57
- question-answer pair 29, 129
- questioning 19–20, 22, 24, 34, 60, 120–21,
163n1, 166n6, 167, 168
- Quintilian, Marcus 20, 25–26, 49n86, 62,
108
- 'rabbinic' style 15, 18–19
- reductionism 38–40, 44n64, 45n69,
122n44
- reflective question 81–111, 128
- repair question 67n57, 120, 132, 138, 152,
161
- repeating echo question 137–39
- repetition 89, 96n62, 106n98, 136–38, 154,
160, 165–66, 168–69
- replies 29, 33n3, 53, 71, 89, 98, 103, 106,
114, 118, 128, 130–31, 135, 149
- representation 57
- request 35, 39, 41, 50, 59, 93, 102, 112, 118,
124, 158
- responsive question 128–44, 158
- retort question 131, 140–44
- rhetoric 4, 9–12, 15–17, 19–27, 33, 61–62,
85, 88, 97, 103n84, 107n101, 113–14, 116,
118, 129, 147, 166n6, 168–71
- rhetorical agreement question 146n3
- rhetorical question *See* qualities of
questions, rhetorical
- riddle 21n22, 67n57, 168, 171n32
- rogatio* 107. *See also* expository question
- root interrogative 35n13. *See also* direct
question
- Sabbath 18, 149
- sarcasm 88n26, 140–42, 144
- second language acquisition 62
- semantics 4, 28, 31, 35n11, 36, 38–48,
65, 70, 75, 77–78, 81–82, 89n30, 96–98,
102–11, 113, 117, 121, 123n50, 130, 132,
134n19, 135, 136n30, 137n36, 138, 143, 145,
148, 154, 159, 160n58
- semi-question 36
- sentence 4, 8–9, 19, 29, 33n3, 34–38,
40–41, 44, 48, 64–65, 108n104, 114,
137n35, 164n4
- Septuagint 64
- sequence question 103–7, 135, 163
- set question 44–45, 76–80, 101, 118
- simplex* 26
- simplistic question 23, 26, 28, 30, 32, 42,
46, 64, 88n26, 91, 103, 105, 115, 117, 121,
134n18
- sociolinguistics 38
- Socrates 4, 9, 19–24, 27, 58, 88, 110,
120n38, 130, 167n15, 169, 172
- Socratic method 18, 20–21, 88, 167n15
- Son of Man 99–103, 149–52, 170
- sophistry 4, 19, 21–23, 163
- speculative question 82, 89n30, 92,
93n44, 93n47, 97–104
- stasis theory 25–26
- style 15, 17–19, 30, 57, 62n25, 127, 162n69
- subiectio* 107. *See also* expository
question
- subject-verb inversion 38, 124, 137n35
- subjunctive 95, 126, 156
- subjunctive interrogative 123. *See also*
deliberative question
- Synoptic Gospels 57–58, 59n9, 122n43,
126–27, 151n19
- syntax 4, 8n24, 28, 35n11, 37–38, 40,
41n42, 43–45, 47–49, 50n87, 51, 64, 70,
73, 77, 81, 88, 90, 91, 95, 97, 100, 103–4,
106n99, 107–9, 111–14, 115n9, 116, 119, 130,
134n19, 137nn35–36, 138, 141, 145, 159–60
- tag question 38, 45, 67n57, 146n3
- Talmud 16, 18–20, 167
- tandem question 100. *See also* dual
question

- tell, interrogative 36–38, 48–49, 53n99, 55, 97, 104
- test question 47, 59, 75n28, 82, 87–91, 117n25, 129, 149n15, 151
- thesis* 26
- Tobit 17
- tragedy 127
- truth 4–5, 9, 11, 18–19, 23, 28, 30–31, 33, 166–68, 171
- turn-taking 6, 12, 55, 76–77, 98–100, 108–9, 118n29, 128–34, 136–39, 141, 143, 149, 151, 152n23
- unconditional question 92–93
- variable question 44–45, 70–79, 81, 83–85, 90, 95, 101, 103, 104n90, 106–9, 114, 130, 137–38, 163
- Varro, Marcus 27
- verb 36–38, 65, 75, 78, 90, 106, 119n33, 121, 123–24, 126, 137n35, 150, 152–54, 158, 160–61
- wh-question 44, 45n67, 71–72, 84n11, 112, 130. *See also* variable question
- wh-word 72, 75n24, 106, 113–14, 137n35
- what 24, 71–72, 76–77, 81–84, 100–103
- when 37, 71–72
- where 72, 137, 163
- whether 24, 46, 119
- which 76–79
- which question 45, 76–79. *See also* set question
- who 72, 79
- why 37, 72, 98, 104, 170
- why question 97–99. *See also* speculative question
- word order 37, 64, 114
- x-question 71. *See also* variable question
- yes/no question 23, 101, 113, 122n44. *See also* polar question
- Zeno of Elea 20

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Old Testament/Hebrew Bible

Genesis		Job	
3:1	17	38:3	16
3:9	163	40:7	16
1 Kings		Ecclesiastes	
10:1–3	16	2:2	17
2 Chronicles		Isaiah	
9:1–3	16	1:11	17

LXX

2 Chronicles		Haggai	
36:23	78n35	2:3	78n35

New Testament

Gospel of Matthew		2:4	2n2, 63n36, 73, 85n14, 131
6:27	78n35	3:1–2	94, 133
22:35	16	3:2	74n22
26:36–46	127	3:3–4	133
27:11	122n43	3:3–5	94
		3:4–9	94
Gospel of Mark		3:5	133
14:32–42	127	3:7–8	134
15:2	122n43	3:9	95n56
		3:9–10	135
Gospel of Luke		3:10	2n2, 8n24, 48, 63n36, 85, 94, 116, 118, 131, 133–36, 164
2:46	16		
11:5	78n35	3:11	94
22:39–46	127	3:11–21	135
23:3	122n43	3:12	73, 83, 94–97, 164
		4:35	116, 155
Gospel of John		5:1	116
1:18	74n22	5:2–3	117
1:34	64	5:5	117
1:35	105	5:6	2n2, 63n36, 113, 116–17, 164, 169
1:37	105		
1:38	1, 2n2, 12, 63n36, 70, 73, 83, 89–90, 104–7, 148, 150, 163–65	5:24	60
		5:44	73, 164
1:41	150	5:47	73, 94, 164
1:42	150	6:5	2n2, 63n36, 73, 85, 88–89, 90n33
1:48	88		
1:50	113, 116, 118, 164	6:25	99

- | | | | |
|---------|---|----------|--|
| 6:26-27 | 99 | 8:45 | 79 |
| 6:30-31 | 99 | 8:45-46 | 77n33 |
| 6:32-33 | 99 | 8:46 | 73, 77-80, 94, 160, 165 |
| 6:35 | 91 | 8:58 | 91 |
| 6:35-40 | 99 | 8:59 | 77 |
| 6:41-42 | 99 | 9:1 | 149 |
| 6:43-51 | 99 | 9:3 | 149 |
| 6:52 | 99 | 9:5 | 91 |
| 6:53-59 | 99 | 9:6-7 | 149 |
| 6:61 | 85, 100, 116, 133, 160, 164 | 9:7 | 150 |
| 6:61-62 | 12 | 9:8-12 | 149 |
| 6:62 | 73, 83, 93n47, 99-103, 165 | 9:13 | 149 |
| 6:67 | 113, 116, 155 | 9:14-34 | 149 |
| 6:70 | 116, 125, 155, 159, 165 | 9:34 | 149 |
| 7:1 | 73 | 9:35 | 2n2, 10, 63n36, 113, 116,
148-52, 165 |
| 7:1-2 | 73 | 10:7-15 | 7 |
| 7:10 | 73 | 10:9 | 91 |
| 7:11 | 73 | 10:11 | 7-8, 48n82, 91 |
| 7:12 | 73 | 10:32 | 70, 77, 165 |
| 7:14 | 73 | 10:34 | 11, 116, 155 |
| 7:15 | 73 | 10:35-36 | 116 |
| 7:16-18 | 73, 75 | 11:1-3 | 85, 142 |
| 7:19 | 2n2, 63n36, 73-76, 104n90,
116, 155, 160, 165, 169 | 11:3-6 | 142 |
| 7:20 | 60, 75 | 11:6-8 | 142 |
| 7:21-24 | 76 | 11:4-16 | 85 |
| 7:23 | 94, 116 | 11:9 | 10, 116, 131, 142-44 |
| 8:2 | 160 | 11:9-10 | 142-43 |
| 8:3-5 | 160 | 11:17 | 155 |
| 8:6 | 160 | 11:17-20 | 85 |
| 8:7 | 160 | 11:18-19 | 155 |
| 8:8 | 160 | 11:20 | 155 |
| 8:9 | 160 | 11:21 | 85 |
| 8:10 | 2n2, 63n36, 70, 73-74, 85,
116, 160-62, 165 | 11:21-26 | 155 |
| 8:12 | 77, 91 | 11:23 | 86 |
| 8:13 | 77 | 11:25 | 91 |
| 8:14 | 109 | 11:25-26 | 86 |
| 8:18 | 109 | 11:26 | 2n2, 63n36, 83, 85-86, 113,
116, 165, 169 |
| 8:19 | 77, 109 | 11:27 | 86 |
| 8:20 | 77 | 11:27-29 | 155 |
| 8:22 | 77 | 11:30-31 | 155 |
| 8:25 | 77, 165 | 11:32 | 155 |
| 8:27 | 109 | 11:34 | 73 |
| 8:33 | 77, 109 | 11:35 | 155 |
| 8:39 | 77, 109 | 11:38-39 | 155 |
| 8:39-40 | 109 | 11:40 | 93, 116, 125, 155-57, 165 |
| 8:41 | 77, 109 | 11:45-54 | 157 |
| 8:42 | 109 | 12:27 | 73, 116, 125 |
| 8:42-44 | 77 | 12:34 | 60, 150 |
| 8:43 | 73, 109-10, 165 | 13:1 | 88, 138 |
| 8:43-45 | 77 | 13:2-16 | 138 |
| 8:44 | 109 | 13:12 | 116, 165 |
| 8:44-45 | 79n39 | 13:18-21 | 139 |

13:23–25	139	18:12–14	120
13:26–28	139	18:19–23	120
13:27–30	139	18:21	73, 165
13:31–36	139	18:23	73, 94, 165
13:36	139	18:24	121
13:37	139	18:28	121
13:38	113, 116, 131, 138–40, 165	18:29	121
14:6	91	18:30–31	121
14:9	73, 116, 155, 165	18:33	121
14:10	116, 155, 165	18:34	2n2, 63n36, 120–23, 165
15:1	91	18:35–37	123
16:19	116, 165	18:37	123
16:30	88	19:28	88
16:31	12, 64, 113, 116, 165, 168	20:15	2, 63n36, 73, 89, 165
17:1–26	89	20:16	150
18:1	89	20:29	113, 116, 165
18:2	89	20:30–31	61
18:2–4	125	20:31	12, 15, 57, 61, 113, 166
18:3	89	21:5	2n2, 63n36, 116, 155, 160
18:4	73, 88–91, 106n96, 164–65	21:15	165
18:5	89	21:15–17	89, 113, 116
18:6	89, 91	21:16	165
18:7	65n49, 73, 89–91, 106n96, 164–65	21:17	2n2, 63n36, 88, 165
18:8	125	21:22	85n14, 94
18:9	125	21:22–23	73
18:10	125	21:23	1, 85n14, 94
18:11	2n2, 63n36, 116, 125–27, 165	21:24–25	57
		21:25	57

Apocrypha

Tobit	
3:15	17

Early Christian

Augustine		Cyril of Jerusalem	
<i>Christian Instruction</i>		<i>Catechetical Lectures</i>	
3.3.6	26n62	13	65n50
<i>Tractates on the Gospel of John</i>		John Chrysostom	
12.6	136n27	<i>Homilies on John</i>	
33.6	162n66	18	58n4
103.2	58n4, 60n17, 89n30	49	75n29
		59	152n25
Cyril of Alexandria		62	87n20
<i>Commentary on John</i>	58n5	83	58n4
		<i>Letter to Diognetus</i>	25

Babylonian Talmud

Shabbat
121b 18–19

Nag Hammadi

Gospel of Thomas
104 78

Classical

Aelius Theon
Rhetorical Exercises
§5 23n45, 24n49

Anaximenes
Rhetoric to Alexander
1427a22–30 25n56

Aristophanes
Birds
428–31 21n29

Clouds 25n53

Aristotle
Categories
1b25–2a10 114n6

Interpretation
17a1–8 4, 23n37
20b22–25 45n66
20b22–30 23n42
20b24–30 23n46

Poetics
1456a33–1456b19 23n37, 23n45
1456b10 48n81
1457a21 48n81

Posterior Analytics
77a28–32 116n20
77a32–34 23n42
89b23–35 24

Rhetoric
1354a 62n24, 169n25
1355b 61n22
1416a6–20 25n56
1419a 23n44, 27n66

Sophistical Refutations
172a23–29 21n22, 46n71

Topics
155b3–160a34 23n42, 23n46
158a14–20 45n66
159a25–39 23n38

Chariton
Chaereas and Callirhoe 25n53

Cicero
Catiline Orations
1.1 26n62

Invention of Rhetoric
1.8 26n60
1.17 26n59

On the Orator
3.116–17 26n60
3.203 108n105

Partitions of Oratory
60 26n60

Demetrius
Style
279 116n18
297 20n21

Diogenes Laertius
Lives of Eminent Philosophers
2.106 166n6
3.24 22n34
3.48 166n6
3.86–87 168n22
7.42 166n6
7.191 3n9

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 8.57 | 20n19 | <i>Protagoras</i> | 136n30 |
| 9.25 | 20n19 | 329a–b | 22n30 |
| | | 335c | 21n29 |
| Hermogenes | | | |
| <i>On Invention</i> | | <i>Theaetetus</i> | |
| 159.1–162.3 | 25n52 | 189e–90a | 42n49, |
| 192.11–194.1 | 120n38 | | 123n53 |
| 193.2–3 | 27n66 | | |
| 193.4 | 123n50 | Plutarch | |
| | | <i>Roman and Greek Questions</i> | 25n53 |
| <i>On Method</i> | | Quintilian | |
| 425.15–426.10 | 25n51 | <i>Institutes of Oratory</i> | 5n15 |
| <i>Rhetorical Exercises</i> | | 1.4.2 | 43n60 |
| §2 | 23n45, 24n49 | 2.4.3 | 6n20 |
| §3 | 25n50 | 2.15.34–36 | 11n42 |
| | | 2.15.38 | 170n30 |
| John of Sardis | | 2.17.12 | 62n25 |
| <i>Commentary on Aphthonius</i> | | 2.20.2–4 | 62n25 |
| §4 | 25n50 | 2.21.1–13 | 11n42 |
| | | 3.4.10 | 4n12, 20n19 |
| Libanius | | 3.5.5 | 97n65 |
| <i>Rhetorical Exercises</i> | 24n49, 25n50 | 3.5.5–18 | 26n60 |
| | | 3.5.11 | 97n65 |
| Longinus | | 3.5.12 | 26n61 |
| <i>On the Sublime</i> | | 3.5.14 | 97n65 |
| 18 | 25n54, 54n102, | 3.10.1–3 | 26n59 |
| | 108n106 | 4.2.34 | 31n86 |
| | | 9.2.6 | 67n58 |
| Nicolaus the Sophist | | 9.2.6–16 | 27n64 |
| <i>Rhetorical Exercises</i> | | 9.2.7 | 49n86 |
| §3 | 23n45, 24n49 | 9.2.8 | 27n64 |
| | | 9.2.10 | 42n53 |
| Plato | | 9.2.11–12 | 123n53 |
| <i>Apology of Socrates</i> | | 9.2.14 | 108n107 |
| 29e | 22n32 | 9.2.14–15 | 108n105 |
| | | 9.3.99 | 21n27 |
| <i>Euthyphro</i> | | 11.3.6 | 47n77 |
| 10a1–4 | 120n38 | 12.1.35 | 27n66 |
| | | | |
| <i>Meno</i> | | Varro | |
| 80e | 21 | <i>On the Latin Language</i> | |
| 86b–c | 21n22, 46n71 | 9.32 | 8n26, 27n65 |
| | | | |
| <i>Phaedrus</i> | | | |
| 261a | 169n26 | | |
| 261a–266d | 166n6 | | |
| 275d | 172n | | |

INDEX OF GREEK TERMS

ἀγών λόγων 21n29
αἰτιολογία 107
ἀντίστροφος 169
ἀπόκρισις 4
ἀπόφανσις 4
ἄρα 38

διαλέγεσθαι 21
διαλεκτική 45n66
διλήμματόν 120, 123

ἐάν 92, 95, 101
εἰ 92, 95–96
εἰ ἔστι 24
ἐλεγχος 22, 88
ἐξέτασις 21n28, 88
ἐνθυμημα 24
ἐντολή 4
ἐπερωτάω 65n49
ἐπερώτησις 26n62
ἐριστικός 21n29, 27
ἔρως 4
ἐρωτηματικόν 8
ἐρώτησις 4, 21n28, 26n62
εὐχολή 4

ἦ 119

θέσεις 26, 97

λόγος 4, 10

μετά ταῦτα 73n18
μήτι 38

οὐ 134
οὐ μή 126
οὐδείς 74n21, 160–61
οὐκ 155
οὐχί 142

πλαστόν ἐπιχείρημα 25
πρόβλημα 166
πύσμα 26n62
πῶς 95, 104, 135

στάσις 25
στιγμή τελεία 8n28

τί ἐστιν 24
τίς 74, 75n24, 78–79, 98, 106
τις 160
τὸ διότι 24
τὸ ὅτι 24

ὑποθέσεις 26, 97n64

χρεία 24